

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE
KINSEY REPORTS ON
SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR**

AN ANALYSIS OF THE
KINSEY REPORTS
ON
SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR
in the Human Male and Female

EDITED BY
DONALD PORTER GEDDES

FREDERICK MULLER LTD
LONDON

**FIRST PUBLISHED BY FREDERICK MULLER LTD.
IN 1904**

**PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
WYMAN AND SONS LTD LONDON
FAKENHAM AND READING**



***“. . . This is science, serious science,
and science in the grand style.”***

CLYDE KLUCKHOHN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	9
SOME COMMENTS BY A PSYCHIATRIST	29
By Sol. W. Ginsburg, M.D., Associate Psychiatrist, Vanderbilt Clinic of Columbia University.	
SO NOBLE AN EFFORT CORRUPTED	39
By Iago Galdston, M.D., Psychiatrist and Secretary, of the Medical Information Bureau, New York Academy of Medicine.	
THE KINSEY REPORT ON WOMEN: SOME SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	47
By Bernard Barber, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Barnard College.	
KINSEY AND THE MORAL PROBLEM OF MAN'S SEXUAL LIFE	61
By Reinhold Niebuhr, Professor of Applied Christian- ity, Union Theological Seminary in New York City.	
EDUCATION ABOUT SEX: CHANGING MOTIVES AND METHODS	71
By Benjamin C. Gruenberg, Sex Educator, Author and Lecturer.	
THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD	93
By Herbert Hyman, Associate Professor of Sociology, Columbia University, and Paul B. Sheatsley, Survey Analyst, National Opinion Research Centre.	
A CRITIQUE OF THE KINSEY REPORT ON THE HUMAN FEMALE	121
By Ashley Montagu, Chairman, Department of Anthropology, Rutgers University in New Jersey.	
IMPLICATIONS OF THE KINSEY REPORT ON WOMEN FOR MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL ADJUSTMENT	135
By Emily Mudd, Director of the Marriage Council of Philadelphia.	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ON THE KINSEY REPORT	143
By Millicent C. McIntosh, President of Barnard College.	
DOCTOR KINSEY'S "SUMMUM BONUM"	149
By Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, Programme Director, Social and Political Subjects, Station WMCA, New York.	
ONE FAMILY'S VIEW	161
By Mrs. W., Mother of four teen-agers.	
SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE YOUNG HUMAN FEMALE AND MALE	173
By Frank J. Curran, M.D., Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry, University of Virginia Medical School and Director of the Children's Service Centre.	
SEX AND THE FEMALE CHARACTER	179
By Eli Ginzberg, Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University.	
THE READING OF KINSEY AS A MEANINGFUL EXPERIENCE	193
By Edward S. Tauber, M.D., Chairman of the Faculty of the William Alanson White Institute in New York City.	
THE MARQUIS DE SADE AND THE FIRST "PSYCHOPATHIA SEXUALIS"	203
By Robert E. Taylor, Assistant Professor of French at New York University.	
THE KINSEY REPORT	222
By Lionel Trilling.	
EPILOGUE	241
BIBLIOGRAPHY	247
INDEX	251

INTRODUCTION

Intellectual Behaviour in the Human Male and Female

Many have objected to Kinsey* because he has applied to the study of sexual behaviour in what he calls human males and human females the method—taxonomic—that he applied to gall wasps.

Many more will doubtless object because this Editor uses the same method in considering the intellectual behaviour of those who have expressed themselves about Kinsey.

Numerous as are the objections to Kinsey's findings, there are few claims that what he is revealing is not so. There are, as mentioned above, objections to his method, and especially are there objections to such conclusions as he draws, and such implications as people infer he implies, and even objections that he should make such a study at all. But there is no objection about one thing, and that is that human beings, male and female, do have a wide range of sexual behaviour.

We may not like some of that behaviour, we may not approve of it, we may think it should be condemned or even punished, we may think that information about it should be printed privately in old Latin, but the fact remains that human beings *do* do these things and have, according to recorded history, done them ever since man learned how to record his impressions of things seen, done, and heard.

How wide is this range? It may begin with masturbation to orgasm at two, and end with heterosexual intercourse to orgasm, at ninety-two.

This, you must admit, is a wide range, but it is not wider

* Reference is made throughout this volume to *Kinsey* and to *the Kinsey Reports*, *the Kinsey findings*, to the *Female Kinsey*, and to the *Male Kinsey*. This is not disrespect; on the contrary, it is the inevitable compliment that comes to people of fame. We refer to *The Marshall Plan*, *The Einstein Theory*, and similarly, as noun, name, adjective or symbol, to Kinsey. In so doing, full credit is assumed for his colleagues and associates, especially Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin and Paul H. Gebhard.

than the intellectual outlets used in reacting to Kinsey himself. We have, for example, a clergyman publicly proclaiming Kinsey's books as "statistical filth." On the other hand, we have a professor of sociology calling the same work "magnificent." These are practically polar opinions, the difference between bad and good, or wrong and right, and error and truth.

It is, Kinsey says, or implies, characteristic of the sexual behaviour of human males and females, that they differ widely, and for what reasons no one seems quite sure, in the ways in which they express themselves sexually. It would seem equally true of the methods of intellectual expression of these same people. This is not to be intended as implying that there is any correlation between sexual expression and intellectual expression, though, as a matter of fact, Kinsey himself does make such a suggestion, and even succeeds in making such correlations. However, it is not the purpose of this piece to go beyond the suggestion, and the forwarding of evidence, that sexual behaviour is not more varied than intellectual expression.

There are those who think sex is sin, that coitus is a necessary evil. There are also those who think that knowledge is a bad thing, that we would be better off if the men of learning took a century or two off, and still better off if we could wipe out all the thinking that has taken place in the last six hundred years.

There are those who think masturbation causes insanity, and there are those who think that homosexuals should be incarcerated. On the other hand there is a human male who said, apropos Kinsey on his sister member of the species, "ninety per cent of women are liars." And there is the jurist who said, "I think the good doctor is wasting the funds of my old *alma mater* exploring the writings on the public toilet walls when what we need so badly are some good stalwart halfbacks to furnish good clean mayhem on fall Saturdays."

On the other hand, there is a psychiatrist, a contributor to this volume, who said, "it [Kinsey's Report] stands out as a courageous and informed challenge to all the salacious bigotry which, for some two thousand years, has sought to and largely succeeded in blocking the objective study and sober comprehension of the patterns of sexual behaviour among humans."

These people are all talking about the same thing—the Kinsey Reports on Men and Women. How, you may wonder,

can there be such diversity of intellectual behaviour? It is a similar problem that Kinsey confronts us with—how can there be such diversity of sexual behaviour?

Intellectual behaviour, sexual behaviour—both vary greatly, neither one more than the other and, probably, both for the same reason. This is called “statistical filth,” not because of genes or chromosomes or hormones, but because of the external conditioning of those who so name it. This is called “magnificent” for the same reason.

The Kinsey Controversy

Curiosity is a measure of ignorance. The extent of the public curiosity about the Kinsey Female Report measured by its treatment in the newspapers and magazines of the country, is probably greater than that ever manifested or demonstrated in connection with any other book ever published. Kinsey was not only front page news. His book was the number one story on the front pages of most of the papers in the country. Curiosity is not only a measure of ignorance; it is also evidence that knowledge which will dispel that ignorance is sought. It is not just that some of us have been ignorant about sex, but that practically all of us have been. And not only us, for our laws, our mores, our theologies, our ethics, all of these have been ignorant about sex also—if Kinsey is to be believed. In any case, Kinsey is not to be denied by those who are ignorant, though he may be by those with special knowledge. Consequently, there are gathered here the opinions of a number of authorities. Their job has been to answer the question: What do you think about Kinsey?

This is no whitewash. The contributors are far from agreeing. But one thing does emerge from all they say, and that is that sex is important in our social as well as our personal and private lives, and that Kinsey has done more to expedite an understanding of it than anyone else.

The Kinsey controversy is broad, deep, general and specific. It involves religion, science, philosophy, ethics, the humanities, and the social sciences. It touches upon the lives of all human beings. Sex is an urge, an impulse, a drive, something we are born with. It manifests itself in the first months of infancy, sometimes even at birth. It lasts until death. It has peaks of

urgency. These peaks, according to the Kinsey studies are not the same in women, as in man.

Sexual expression, stemming from that which is innate, is substantially affected by external stimuli and conditions. Therefore the way men and women behave sexually is the product of these two factors. The innate, or internal, factors are more or less the same for all human beings. The external, or conditioned, factors are as varied as the languages, the religions, the ways of living, the modes of dress, the degrees of civilization, and the economic positions of the peoples of the earth.

There are seventeen contributing authors to this work. Three of them are psychiatrists and psychoanalysts; one is a psychiatrist; one is a sex educator; another is a college president; there is a marriage counsellor; an anthropologist; an author-columnist-radio-forum-leader; a social psychologist collaborating with a survey analyst; an economist; a theologian; a sociologist; a literary scholar; and a mother of four adolescents, who is and claims to be nothing more than an expert on her own family.

Five of these contributing authors are cited by Kinsey for studies they have made and are listed in his bibliography. They are Emily Mudd, the marriage counsellor; Tauber, one of the psychiatrists who is also a psychoanalyst; Gruenberg, the sex educator; Montagu, the anthropologist; and Bromley, the author-columnist-radio-forum-leader. Dr. Mudd is also one of the five Consulting Editors to *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*. And Mrs. Bromley is the co-author of one of the thirty-one systematic studies of sexual behaviour which antedated Kinsey's first volume.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find these seventeen authors, in their sixteen articles, approaching Kinsey from so many different points of the cultural compass. The sociologist, for example, is interested not only in the social causes of sexual behaviours which he thinks Kinsey unduly emphasizes as being biologic in origin, but also in the social consequences of Kinsey himself. This latter point also concerns the college educator, who fears that some of these consequences may cause young men and women to try and keep up with Kinsey.

Separation of sex from the whole spiritual man is the point our theologian protests. The sex educator is concerned not only with sex education as a pedagogical proposition, but also, and maybe primarily, as an aspect of character education; but he

finds little agreement as to what that character-goal should be. Method is what the social psychologist and the survey analyst are interested in. This is also one of the primary interests of the public. Statistically, has Kinsey done a good job? Is it valid? Can it be relied upon?

The anthropologist, despite marked and ~~sharp~~ criticism, concludes that the Kinsey Female volume is one of the most important books on sexual behaviour ever written, because it makes clear that females and males develop sexually at different rates and according to different patterns, that the male reaches his peak in the teens and the female later, that women are less given to perversities, because it corrects absurd beliefs about pre-marital petting and masturbation, because it brings the legal aspects of sex to the fore, and finally because it brings a much needed wholesomeness to the subject.

Whereas the college president thinks Kinsey a tremendous challenge to those responsible for the education of the young, she feels that consideration of it should be left to experts. On the other hand, the marriage counsellor believes that the most needed thing is group discussion of sexual behaviour. One of the psychiatric analysts, a specialist in child psychiatry, definitely recommends the reading of Kinsey by parents.

Like the theologian, the author-columnist-radio-forum-leader is much disturbed over the failure to consider emotional factors. She says there is more to be learned about the sexual nature of man in *From Here to Eternity* than in Kinsey. The mother, speaking solely for herself, remarks that she found Kinsey full of love, that the whole report emphasizes the importance of love. And contrary to the college president's concern, she reported little evidence that her children were excited or bothered about Kinsey.

Two of the psychiatric analysts take issue with Kinsey in terms of his failure to have benefited from previous criticisms and offers of assistance. One of them is unhappy about the top-secret, cabalistic manner in which information about the second volume was released.

The economist says that data by themselves are of little social value, that they must be tested against pertinent hypotheses. He sets up such hypotheses, and concludes that Kinsey's findings contribute little so far to the integrity of the family.

The third psychiatric analyst points out that "little productive

understanding will result if laymen look here for reassurance and scientists for certainty. To make the most out of Kinsey, he believes the reader has to project himself into an investigatory position, and avoid using the material for his own ends.

The fifteenth contribution is by a literary man, an expert in French literature, and especially in the man whose name was perpetuated in the word "sadism." This man, the Marquis de Sade, is presented as a forerunner of both Kinsey and Krafft-Ebing. There is a social aspect of sex. This account of Sade and the society in which he lived, the society that produced him, is the opposite side of the coin of personal sex. This is a part of the sex problem, even of the contemporary sex problem.

There are Two Books

Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female is a book of 872 pages. It was published in September 1953, by W. B. Saunders Company, medical publishers, of Philadelphia. Known as the "Kinsey Report on Women," it does not have a single author, being the product of the Staff of The Institute for Sex Research, which is located at Indiana University, in Bloomington, Indiana.

The Staff is composed of four Research Associates; these—Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard—are the interviewers, and the only ones. The other members of the staff are six Research Assistants whose functions are indicated as: Library, Reference Research, Statistical Calculator, Photographic Studies, Translator, and Secretary. There are two other Research Associates who devote their time to Legal Studies. And there is one Special Translator.

Five persons are listed as Consulting Editors: Jerome Cornfield and Harold Dorn in Statistics; Robert Laidlaw, M.D., in Psychiatry; Karl Lashley in Psychology and Neurophysiology; and Emily Mudd, a contributing author in this present volume, in Marriage Counselling.

The work was first begun in 1938 with, "the staunch and generous support of the administration of Indiana University." Three years later Kinsey applied for assistance from the Committee for Research on Problems of Sex of the National Research Council. After a year of "exceptionally thorough and

painstaking" inquiry, assistance was granted with the aid of funds supplied by the Medical Division of The Rockefeller Foundation.

As of the time *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* went to press, the Committee for Research on Problems of Sex of the Medical Division of the National Research Council, which is itself an agency of the National Academy of Sciences, was composed of the following: George W. Corner, M.D., Chairman, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington; Willard M. Allen, M.D., of Washington University; Clyde L. Kluckhohn, of Harvard University; Karl S. Lashley, Director of the Yerkes Laboratories for Primate Biology; C. N. H. Long, of Yale University; Carl R. Moore, of The University of Chicago; James V. Neel, of the University of Michigan; and Milton C. Winternitz, M.D., Director of the Division of Medical Sciences of the National Research Council.

This study was undertaken, in the first place, we learn, because students at Indiana University came to Kinsey, then a teacher of biology, for answers to problems of a sexual nature which they could not find in the many sources available to them, and which Kinsey himself could not find.

It was apparent to them, and to Kinsey too, that there was a lack of factual information that was not "biased by moral, philosophic, or social interpretations." But ironically, one of the major criticisms of Kinsey is the fact that he has failed to take into account these very factors, the presence of which in the old works on sex had obscured understanding.

In size and organization, at first glance the two books appear to be similar. The Male Book was 820 pages long; the Female is 872. Each is divided into two parts. Each is preceded by preliminary matter: Preface and Acknowledgments in the Male, and Foreword and Acknowledgments in the Female. And each concludes with a Bibliography and Index. The preliminary matter in the Male volume fills sixteen pages; in the Female, about twice as much, thirty; so, also with the back matter: the Bibliography in the Male is twenty-two pages long, and in the Female, forty-eight; while the Index in the Male occupies sixteen pages, and the Female, thirty-two. It may be noted, though, that the index in the Female contains about ten per cent more line entries per page than the Male—consequently, one might assume that the Female index is actually more than twice as long as the Male index.

Subtracting the front and back matter, one finds that, the smaller book—the Male, with a total of 820 pages—has a larger body of text, 766 pages, than the 872-page Female volume, which reduces to 762 pages. However, there is another factor that must be considered. Both volumes are plentifully supplied with tables and figures. A rough calculation suggests that, in the Male, these take up a total of 301 pages, and in the Female, 216, or about two-thirds as much space.

These calculations enable us to arrive at a fair idea of the amount of reading matter in the two books: 465 pages for the Male, and 546, for the Female.

As for organization, each volume is divided into three parts, the first of which is essentially the same in both volumes, being devoted to History and Method. In these first parts, the statistical procedure is explained, after the inception of the project has been recounted. Space is given to the problems of interviewing, sources of data, validity, and so forth. A fuller explanation is to be found in the Male than in the Female, there being no occasion for duplicating all points in each book. Part One fills 156 pages in the Male and only 100 in the Female.

One notable addition has been made to this part of the Female volume. It is a three-part statement, in Chapter One, on the history, the philosophy, the purpose, and the value of science as *science*. This statement is embraced in the sections headed "The Scientific Objective," "The Right To Investigate," and "The Individual's Right to Know."

Part Two of the Male volume is entitled "Factors Affecting Sexual Outlet." Part Two of the Female, though, is entitled "Types of Sexual Activity Among Females," and compares with and, in part, serves the same function as Part Three in the Male, which is entitled "Sources of Sexual Outlet." In these parts, in both volumes, the frequencies, incidences and techniques of the various activities by means of which human males and females achieve orgasm are listed according to "Outlets" in the Male volume, and "Types of Sexual Activity" for the Female volume. In both instances, "Outlets" and "Types" correspond: Masturbation, Nocturnal Emissions (for the Male), Nocturnal Sex Dreams (for the Female), Petting (Heterosexual for the Male, Pre-marital for the Female), Pre-marital Intercourse (Male)—Pre-marital Coitus (Female), Marital Intercourse (Male)—Coitus (Female), Extra-marital

Intercourse (Male)—Coitus (Female), Homosexual Outlet (Male)—Responses and Contacts (Female), Animal Contacts.

The differences between Male, Part II, and Female, Part II, appear to be, first, that the Male book contains a section on Intercourse with Prostitutes, which the Female does not; and the Female has a section, "Pre-Adolescent Sexual Development," which the Male does not. In the Male volume, though, there is, in Part II, a chapter entitled "Early Sexual Growth and Activity." But there is a greater difference. Much of Part II in the Male has to do with the correlation of conditioning factors in sexual behaviour, the attitudes of people in various economic, religious, educational levels toward various types of sexual activity, such as position in coitus, the acceptability or unacceptability of nudity, and so forth. In the Female volume, this information has been incorporated into Part II, and consequently Part II in the Female will be found to be 466 pages long, whereas the analogous section in the Male is only 183 pages long.

We have now explained Part I in both volumes, Part II in both, and Part III in the Male. What about Part III in the Female? Here is the great difference between the two volumes.

Part Three of the Female is entitled "Comparisons of Female and Male." It is divided into five chapters that are devoted, two of them, to sexual response and orgasm, and three of them to sexual response. These chapters treat of their subjects according to four purely scientific disciplines—anatomy, physiology, neurology and endocrinology—and one semi-scientific discipline—psychology.

Part Three constitutes the great difference between the two volumes. There are other differences, of course, such as the Female section on Masturbation, where techniques differ so much from the Male. But in other respects, the two volumes treat essentially of the same subjects and in the same way. The different treatments, statistically, are explained by Hyman and Sheatsley in their analysis of the methodology of this work. But otherwise, the "something new" that has been added is Part Three. And a great amount of critical attention has been devoted to this part.

It is in this part, for example, that Kinsey compares the mechanisms and the processes of orgasm that lead him to the conclusion that there is no difference, physiologically, between

orgasm in male and orgasm in female, or between the capacity of each sex to have orgasm.

Each of Kinsey's outlet chapters in his Report on the Female ends with a Summary and Comparison of Female and Male findings. If there is a difference between the sexual behaviour of females and males, this is where the evidence would show. In connection with Nocturnal Sex Dreams, causes and contents appear to be the same. Females have sex dreams as the result of psychological or physiological stimulation, and apparently their dreams are mainly tenanted with actual experiences. Males, however, have such dreams more frequently than females, and more males have such dreams. Possibly the most interesting data is that which shows that females have more dreams of this nature, resulting in orgasm, during their forties, whereas males reach their peak during their teens and twenties. This corresponds to the sexual capacities of males and females, the male being definitely on the decline in the twenties while the female is reaching the long plateau of her interest and ability.

Among teenagers, there seems to be a distinct difference between necking and petting, a distinction that Kinsey recognises but does not observe. Necking is considered to be *anything* from the neck up. Necking, some of the young say, is nice; petting is not. Petting is everything *but*. One young man recently made this discerning observation: ". . . when you're spooking you naturally slide into petting and you can convince yourself you're still just necking after it's all over." This is not surprising in view of the fact that the mouth is, next to the genitalia, the most erogenous zone of the human body. Arousal can be started, if not effected, by necking. Probably Kinsey realised, too, how easy it is to slide from necking to petting. At any rate, he considers them as one outlet. It is an outlet that runs the whole gamut of sexual behaviour short of intromission itself. In males, petting was more frequent among those of higher economic and intellectual levels, a fact that caused Professor Eli Ginzberg to comment on the phenomenon of "delayed gratification"—the lower economic and intellectual males being quicker to resort to pre-marital intercourse. Interestingly, though, in connection with the female there seems to be no such correlation. But a definite inhibiting factor in petting to orgasm among females did seem to be the degree of religious devotion.

One of the most controversial Kinsey observations relates to his statement that petting "definitely . . . contributes to improvement of marital coitus." This observation is made with respect to females.

• Kinsey's previous volume revealed that most males masturbate at one time or another. The present volume shows that masturbation in the female is about two-thirds as frequent as in the male. As would be expected, masturbation decreases after marriage in both the male and female, but not as much in the female as in the male. The reason for this is quite clear. The word frigidity, the incapacity of the female to achieve orgasm, comes into the investigation at this point. One of the most frequent predictions about this female study was that the large percentage of American women who are frigid would be revealed.

But the fact seems to be that few women are frigid. The evidence for this comes from the figures on orgasm in females through masturbation and homosexual activities. Frigidity, says Kinsey, is a man-made institution. The female is as capable of orgasm as the male. What we have called frigidity is related to what we can only call male ignorance of female anatomy. The female achieves orgasm, Kinsey says, in ninety-five per cent of her masturbatory activity. This is a higher rate of orgasm than for any other kind of female sexual activity. Dr. Kinsey attributes the slowness of the female to achieve orgasm in coitus, or her failure to do so, not to any incapacity that might be called frigidity, but rather to ineffectual techniques of intercourse. This is a point that the late Dr. Dickinson emphasised, and which is graphically demonstrated in his *Atlas of Human Sex Anatomy*.

Like petting to orgasm, Kinsey believes that female masturbation before marriage contributes to more satisfactory coitus in marriage.

Of the women contained in this sample, the figures show that about half of them had had intercourse before marriage, but that only two-thirds of them had reached orgasm in their pre-marital coitus. But it should be remembered that this sample is a limited one. It does not include Negro females, or women in prison, nor is it representative of women in the lower economic and intellectual groups, or those in parts of the country other than the North-east. It is an incomplete sample and recognised as such. Even so, it presents some

interesting comparisons with the more representative male sample.

In marital intercourse the incidence of orgasm varies greatly. Of those reporting, a tenth had never reached orgasm, but the average female in the sample reached orgasm in something between seventy and seventy-seven per cent of her marital coitus. Marital intercourse declines with age, as the result, Kinsey says, not of the females' loss of interest, but rather because of the male's ageing.

With respect to extra-marital intercourse, a fourth of the females had been so engaged at one time or another; their reasons for doing so range from doing a favour for a friend to obtaining revenge for a spouse's action.

As was the case for males, Dr. Kinsey has used a seven-point scale for measuring the extent of homosexuality in sexual behaviour of females. This scale ranges from 0 to 6, zero representing no homosexual activity at all, and six representing nothing but homosexual activity. Three, then, represents those humans whose sexual activity has been divided equally between homosexual activity and non-homosexual activity. One and two, then, represent increasing degrees, approaching an even division; and four and five, increasing degrees approaching totality. This is characteristic of homosexuality, not only as revealed by Kinsey, but as it has long been understood by psychiatrists. There are few total homosexuals, and not so many who have never experienced homosexual arousal, but there are many who have had some homosexual experience, and some who are simultaneously engaged in both homosexual and heterosexual activities. Legally, there has been little recognition of this difference of degree, or division of activity. To a great extent, society has looked at homosexuality as an "all or none," a "black or white" proposition; one was a homosexual or one was not, and one revealed homosexual experience made one homosexual. Strangely, society is very little concerned with homosexuality in women, whereas it is particularly active and repressive about males. One reason for this seems to be that women tend to confine their relations to a single partner, whereas men tend to promiscuity. This, on the other hand, may be due in part to the fact that society is little concerned with women living together, and often suspicious of such arrangements among males. There is some correlation between female homosexuality

and educational levels, with more on the upper than on the lower.

Of animal contacts, and orgasm effected through this outlet, the quantity for females is insignificant. Relations between females and animals are more a matter of myth and fable than of present practice, though they do exist.

Out of this organisation of tables, figures, comparisons and summaries, certain evidences and conditions of actuality emerge. The human female is possessed of the capacity for sexual arousal, and even for orgasm, from infancy to late in life. Certainly, the beginning and ending of menstruation are merely conspicuous points on a very much longer life of sexuality. In effecting orgasm, the female engages in all of the activities in which the male is involved. These are dreaming, masturbation, coitus, homosexuality, and animal contacts. Of these, the most frequent are masturbation, coitus and homosexuality. Of these three, the most effective in achieving orgasm are masturbation and homosexuality. The commonest outlet is coitus or intercourse.

Kinsey sheds much light in his examination of the anatomy and the neurology of response and orgasm. Again, it must be stressed that what makes his work so significant is not so much that Kinsey has discovered facts that others have not known, but rather that he has brought a greater number of facts together, and correlated them with previously non-existent figures. It has been popularly believed that females are slow to reach orgasm and that males are quick, and that much of the discord in marriage has resulted from the consequent physical and psychological dissatisfaction. The masturbatory data reveal that women are not slow to reach orgasm, on the contrary, that they are as quick as men, probably within a matter of seconds.

The incidence of orgasm in experienced female homosexuals suggests this same conclusion. Clitoral orgasm is characteristic of female masturbation and of most female homosexuality. In neither instance is there any marked amount of vaginal insertion. In coitus, on the other hand, vaginal insertion is the chief characteristic of customary techniques. There would seem to be a marked degree of correlation between orgasm in intercourse and coital techniques that engage and stimulate the clitoris. Women would seem to be wiser in this respect than men, and frigidity would seem to be related to inadequate

stimulation, rather than to any innate incapacity. It would also seem to correlate with the incidence of female masturbation after arousal through petting, or non-fulfilment in intercourse.

The sexual difference between males and females is not to be found in a difference in physiological capacity, but rather in the fact that males are susceptible to a much greater extent than females to psychological stimuli, and that the high peak of male sexual activity has declined considerably at the time that female sexual capacity has just about reached the long maximal plateau that extends from the mid-twenties into the forties and fifties. Males are more quickly aroused by certain stimuli, and the emphasis here should be on the word *certain*.

Orgasm in sexual intercourse, when the highest degree of mutual love mediates the partners, can be likened to the crescendo, climax, and sudden stillness achieved by an orchestra of human emotions. Kinsey has likened it to an explosion of tensions, and to sneezing—an involuntary concourse of effect resulting when the apogee of ascension of marvellously synchronised organs and senses has been reached.

Much of the stuff of poetry has related to the effect of orgasm, and even more to the effect of arousal on lovers. Such Empyrean expressions have, it would appear, contained remarkable insight into the anatomy and physiology, and even the neurology, of sexual stimulation, and the conditions of the pre-orgastic state. The cherry-ripe lips, characteristically engorged with blood, the cheeks flushed because of the increase of peripheral circulation, the blindness of love, the singleness of purpose of amorally engaged individuals—all these can be accounted for by Kinsey, and by those authorities he draws upon.

The quickening of the heart of the lover as he views his beloved, the rapidity of breathing, the feeling that there is nothing that could not be done, no feat of strength or courage, for the object of one's devotion, when the lover is truly in love, all these are recognised results of the orgastic syndrome.

The anatomy, the physiology, the neurology, the endocrinology, and the psychology of orgasm confirm all of these lyrical ideas. The human male and the human female are sensitive to two kinds of sexual stimulation; these are tactile and psychological.

It would seem that the whole personal past of any human

being is a vast arsenal of associative or recollective, conscious or unconscious, emotional ammunition that can be brought to bear upon the sexual response of that individual. Such response can be positive, or it can be negative; it may promote, or it may inhibit, stimulation and arousal.

In addition, though, each human male and female is susceptible to tactile stimulation. There is no part of the human body that is not well supplied with nerve ends; the impossibility of finding a place on the human body where the prick of a pin cannot be felt is evidence of this.

There are, however, many parts of the human body the stimulation of which contribute to the build-up of sexual awareness, arousal, and fulfilment. The two parts of the body most susceptible to such stimulation and effect are the genitalia and the mouth. These are known as areas of erogony, but there are many other such areas, some more, some less, but all to one extent or another susceptible and contributory—when stimulated—to such effect. These range from the ears, the neck, the breasts, to the instep of the foot, the toes, the thighs, the palms of the hands, the armpits, the anal areas, the pubic regions, and the abdomen. By psychologic association, other areas may also be susceptible of involvement.

It is common knowledge that the male penis is highly sensitised, the most highly sensitised, when tumescent, of any part of the male body. The data that Kinsey uses make the female homologue of the penis, the clitoris, the most sensitive organ of the female body. Failure to recognise the significance of this vestigial organ, and of the almost equally important sensitivity of the labia minora—the inner lips of the vagina—are, Kinsey says, the chief cause of the failure of so many females to reach orgasm in coitus.

Reference has been made to orgasm as a syndrome, that is to say, a complex of occurrences. Love is much more than an affair of the heart. It is also an affair of the lungs, the blood pressure, the actual flow of blood—that is, the parts of the body to which it is directed in larger or smaller quantities; the whole nervous system, and the endocrines—the glands which pour out, upon occasion, into the blood stream, chemicals capable of many effects.

Sexual stimulation, leading to arousal and orgasm, brings all of these instruments into play. Their effect upon the human being is manifold. Memory fades, sensitivity to light and

sound diminish or change, attention reduces to a small focus; the rate of the heartbeat, the pressure of the blood, respiration, muscular movements, involuntary—due to muscular response to hormones—assume conspicuous importance and significance.

Upon orgasm, this condition suddenly abates. In a matter of seconds, sometimes, the body returns to normal.

Orgasm, in the male, is usually associated with ejaculation, but Kinsey emphasises that there is no ejaculation in pre-adolescent males, or in adult males who, as the result of surgery, lack the organs of ejaculation, though this does not necessarily result in a diminution of desire or an inability to perform sexually. This, as Tauber points out herein, confirming Kinsey, is even true of castrates.

The significance of orgasm would seem to be twofold; in the male, to set off the transportative mechanism that conveys the vehicle of the sperm to the site of appropriate conjunction with the ovum, and also to return the total organism to normal. This second function would apparently be applicable to the female as well.

That pre-coital play or stimulation is natural might also be assumed, because scientific evidence suggests that the human female is least sensitive to stimuli at the time of ovulation, when she is most pregnable, and that she is most sensitive to stimuli and arousal when she is "safest," that is, immediately before and after menstruation.

Kinsey and his associates say that the most important fact they can report on, as the result of their studies to date, is that there is no one person who is represented by their figures. Each person is a unique combination of the data.

It has been suggested that sex is a great sea in which we all live, and that these data are merely the boundaries and the depths and the qualities of that sea. Each location in that sea is different for what might be called sexual latitude, longitude, and depth. Furthermore, no one's position in that sea is fixed.

Sexual behaviour is not a constant in females or males. As youths they behave in one way. As adults, they may behave quite differently. There are people who have engaged in all of these outlets that Kinsey has used for classification. There are persons who presumably have engaged in none of them. There are probably some who engage in all of them. Most of these people, regardless of the composition of their sexual

patterns, are good human beings, engaged in productive work. There are, to be sure, some who are socially unproductive, because of their sexual behaviours, and others who are ill. On the whole, however, human beings assume their responsibilities on the basis of their capacities and opportunities, and carry them out as best they can. There is no sexual pattern that fits with the most productive kind of citizen, or the healthiest human, or the happiest individual. Each person has to work these things out for himself. On the other hand, as the anthropologist George P. Murdock shows, there is no society that does not put some restraint on human sexual behaviour, there is no religion that does not have a part in this regulation, and there is no system of unwritten laws, of mores, that does not bring pressure to bear upon what individuals do sexually. But there is conflict between individual behaviour and social attitude when the behaviour of so many individuals is counter to so many regulatory prohibitions and disapprovals. Ours is one of the few societies that has a general taboo against sex prior to marriage. This taboo is not effective; it makes more people sinners and criminals and sufferers—the “sexually miserables,” as Dollard has called them—than we like to admit.

What About Love?

Probably the objection to Kinsey, the chief complaint about his Reports, has been the fact that he does not treat of love, that he reduces sex to an animalistic basis, as though sex and love were not related, even as though he, Kinsey, did not know about love.

Certainly there is an emphasis here on sex as sex. It is counted in terms of a physiological reaction called orgasm. It is located in terms called “outlets,” these being techniques for achieving orgasm. And he talks in terms of the incidences and frequencies of orgasm effected by means of these outlets.

On first thought, love and sex seem one and the same. But are they? What is love? Why is it that Kinsey has avoided the question? Has he avoided it, or has he evaded it? The answer to these questions is important, maybe as important as any other that is raised, legitimately and directly, about the Kinsey studies.

Love is a euphemism. It means practically anything and all that one wants it to mean. It is a polite word for sexual intercourse. It is a word for the feeling a mother has toward a child. It is the word that is used for the feeling God has toward his children. It is the way we feel toward chocolate ice-cream, if we particularly like chocolate ice-cream. It expresses our willingness or eagerness to go to the movies with someone. It is the word that is used to express patriotism. It is the word that is used in connection with the affection human beings have for other human beings—the love of mankind.

The most important thing about man is that he is human, that he is different from other animals in his capacity, self-developed, for being bigger and better than himself. He does this, to paraphrase the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead, by directing his purposes to ends which he realises are more for the good of mankind than they are for himself alone. He does this because he has a capacity for judgment that stretches beyond the facts of existence to the values of existence. He does this because he has had that element of what we call virtue, the purposes of which are to create and behave in accordance with values that are to the advantage of others, rather than to the exclusive advantage of himself. Man is human, because in so creating virtue, in making himself virtuous, and behaving virtuously—that is for the benefit of others—he does something for others that transforms itself into value to himself.

This is hoisting oneself by one's bootstraps. It is more: it is hoisting oneself by the bootstraps of others. It is still more: it is hoisting others by one's own bootstraps.

In the process of so hoisting himself and others, man has developed reasons and rationalisations for such behaviour. These acquire such names as co-operation, altruism, love, devotion, philanthropy. Animals have such capacity, too, but not to such an extent as man. And the large extension of these capacities are characteristically what we call human motives.

At the same time, man is possessed of certain characteristics that are, in an unmodified fashion, also common to animals. He is driven to find food. He is, instinctively, motivated to escape conspicuous danger. And he is impelled, by innate forces, to reproduce himself. This drive is, in the main, called sex. Its manifestation is conditionable, though the basic drive is inborn. If sex can be used as a verb, it could be said that

man will, because of that which was built into him, sex. But the manner in which he will sex will be the product of the influence of conditioning upon that with which he was born.

In sexing, man behaves, demonstrably, in many different ways. In some instances he masturbates, solitarily. In others, he effects coitus. In still others, he fantasies—that is he just thinks. •

In these instances, his ^{penis} genitals are involved directly, and he achieves what is known as orgasm.

In other instances, though, no genitals or orgasm are involved, yet he is still sexing.

There must be a difference between being sexed, that is, being a sexual individual, and sexing, which would be an individual in the process of emphasising his sexual capacity, ability, and even his ingenuity.

All humans are sexed, and all humans sex. But the most human of sexual humans sex in such a way that they contribute to what was paraphrased of Whitehead at the beginning of this section, that is, in such a way, that they think more of the good of others than of themselves, that they are more impressed by values than by facts, that they derive more satisfaction doing things for others than for themselves, and that, as a matter of fact, they derive their greatest satisfaction when they have done things for others without hope of benefit to themselves. This is what sexed human beings can do, when they sex in their most unanimalistic manner.

But what happens when they sex in their least human manner, these sexed human beings? They will be more interested in doing what they call good for themselves, as opposed to doing it for others; they will be more impressed by facts than by values, by things than by ideas; and they will derive the least satisfaction from doing something altruistic, and the most satisfaction from doing something completely selfish. They will be of the flesh, rather than of the mind, they will think of the moment rather than of the future. They will be cruel, rather than kind. They will be criminal, rather than law-abiding. They will be tyrants, rather than citizens.

Cruel, criminal, and tyrannical human beings impose themselves upon others, as individuals in rape, or as dictators in politics. Hitler was a sexual individual, however he sublimated his sex. It is not far-fetched to say that he sexed the whole German people. It is certainly fair to say that inmates of

Buchenwald were sexed to death by keepers and administrators who knew nothing of being human, as Whitehead has expressed the character and nature of being human.

The expression of individual sex is in what individuals do, sexually. The expression of social sex is in what society does, as it is composed of sexual individuals. When society makes circuses out of executions, when it invents extremities of torture and presents them as superior methods of entertainment, then the sex of many individuals has run amok and love, and God, have fallen by the wayside.

A Source of Error

**ATOMISM
OF BEHAVIOUR**

Sol W. Ginsburg, M.D.

SOL W. GINSBURG is a prominent New York psychiatrist, and the author of numerous articles in the field of social psychiatry. At present Dr. Ginsburg is associate psychiatrist at the Vanderbilt Clinic of Columbia University, and for many years he held the same position at Mount Sinai Hospital. He is consultant in psychiatry at the Conservation of Human Resources Project of Columbia University and a special consultant at the Centre for Human Relations Studies of New York University; has lectured at the New York School of Social Work and at the Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons; and is also associate professor of clinical psychiatry at the Long Island College of Medicine.

In addition to his private practice, his hospital connections, his teaching, his work as a consultant in social psychiatry and numerous other professional activities, Dr. Ginsburg has been, since 1945, Medical Director of the Committee on the Study of Ambulatory Care of Psychiatric Patients of the New York City Committee on Mental Hygiene. He is a member of the editorial board of the American Orthopsychiatric *Journal*, and a co-author of two books, edited by Eli Ginzberg,

ATOMISM OF BEHAVIOUR

Sol W. Ginsburg

In the 40's, when rumours began to drift into the community that an exhaustive study on the sexual behaviour of humans was being conducted by a group of distinguished scientists, headed by a well known entomologist, the news was welcomed by none more than by psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. Since our work inevitably brings us in contact with the details of the intimacies of people's sexual lives and with the manifold problems vast numbers of people have with their sexual lives, we were only too aware of the fact that there were large gaps in our knowledge that needed to be studied and analysed much more intensively. From the beginning, however, there were certain things about the study that disquieted many of us. There was an aura of secrecy about it that seemed quite unnecessary for a scientific work in progress, and along with the hush-hush a certain almost exhibitionistic need to stir up questions and curiosity about the contents of the report, which increasingly resulted in a plethora of rumours, jokes, hints of great truths to be revealed, and almost a frenzy of public concern as the time for publication drew near. Each postponement of the publication date was noted in the Press, always with a hint that when finally issued, this book would prove revolutionary in nature, and affect the welfare and adjustment of the entire community.

When the first volume of the Report appeared in 1948, it was received with a wide gamut of reactions, ranging from entirely unjustified and destructive criticism, especially by the representatives of certain religious groups, to rabid exploitation by popularisers and panderers to the public taste. I think it is quite fair to say that nowhere did the book receive more careful, if often outspokenly negative, criticism than in the psychiatric Press, where it was reviewed at great length by such distinguished psychiatrists and psychoanalysts as Kubie, Margolin, Knight and others.

A re-reading of these criticisms at this time persuades me

that with the exception of a very few instances the reviewers were eminently fair, went to great extremes to emphasise the sincerity and devotion of the investigators and their intellectual and ethical responsibility, and constantly to underscore their appreciation of the very real contribution the book had made to our knowledge of sexual behaviour. However, it was pointed out again and again that one of the greatest lacks in this study was the authors' almost complete unawareness of psychoanalytic theory. Just as the statisticians anticipated that before the appearance of subsequent volumes corrections would be made in obvious statistical omissions and errors, psychiatrists and psychoanalysts ventured to express their hope that the authors would try to consult and learn from suitable members of their groups who offered their services in this regard.

Many of the same phenomena which have been noted have attended the publication of the second volume of this study, on the sexual behaviour of the human female, but perhaps in an even more exaggerated form. Not only were there rumours and hints in the Press, but the establishment by the authors of a kind of secret conclave, at which the facts of the Report would be given only to reporters who signed a written statement swearing that they would not release the material before a certain date, increased the almost hysterical curiosity in the Press (even, in part, the more responsible Press). This obviously cultivated aura of secrecy, of imminent and earth-shaking truths about to be revealed, was greater than ever. I do not mean to say that the authors of this book were themselves actually responsible for creating this hysteria, but they certainly cannot escape a good deal of responsibility for the kind of public appeal which was made on behalf of the book and for the efforts to stir up entirely unjustified, morbid curiosity and concern among the laity.

As a matter of fact, one of the first questions that must pose itself to any psychiatrist is why this interest could be mobilised, and why, if even over a short period of time, great masses of people of all classes, educational and social backgrounds seemed consumed with curiosity about the Kinsey Report. There are few better indices of people's concern with phenomena than a sudden outpouring of "jokes" of doubtful humour, and obviously masking considerable anxiety. For weeks there was a general epidemic of such jokes, often very old and stale ones refurbished to fit the current situation.

There are probably some people who anticipated the book with frankly morbid interests of almost a voyeuristic nature. However, I doubt if these are relatively very numerous. Most people who responded in this excited manner probably did so out of deep feelings of insecurity and doubt about their sexual normalcy and adequacy, feelings which are known to be widespread in our culture. This reaction from the screaming headlines about "K" day to the stories of adolescent school girls "chipping in" to buy a copy of the book to "study" is additional testimony to the prevalence of doubt, anxiety and deeply felt guilt which still persists. Just as with other self-help books, great numbers of people must have turned to the Kinsey Report for statistical validation, so to speak, of their normalcy, for an answer to the plaguing question, "Am I the only one; is this or that my personal 'leprosy' or do others also think about and do this awful, guilt-laden thing?"

Unfortunately, the publicity and the advertising for the book, wittingly or otherwise, does much to cultivate the idea that one may find just such solace and reassurance within its covers. I think this is a totally forlorn hope, since we know only too well that except in rare instances guilt is not so easily handled, and the fact that an individual discovers that this or that practice in which he indulges with considerable guilt is also practiced by a certain percentage of the population is, I am sure, of small benefit; and such benefit, where it accrued, it almost certainly only temporary.

Kinsey and Freud

A patient of mine, a young and extremely intelligent woman, with a relatively simple anxiety state, was fairly breathless waiting to "look up" what percentage of women had extra-marital affairs, as she had on one occasion. The day after she had found the appropriate statistic she said to me plaintively, "It's a hell of a small comfort to know you are one of a per cent of a random sample."

Still another illusion has been cultivated in the minds of the laity for which there seems to me to be even less basis than the notion that one can find help for oneself and one's anxieties in the Report. That is the idea that the book will help people establish greater controls in their sexual behaviour. The basis

for this escapes me; obviously the book would, if it accomplished anything of this sort, tend to strengthen extremely permissive attitudes and to lend sanction to behaviour of questionable usefulness and maturity.

I find it even more difficult to understand on what basis the book is offered as an important adjunct to useful education in sexual matters. Thus a critic is quoted in the advertisements as saying, "For mature readers it offers valuable guides to child rearing, parent-child relationships, harmonious marriage relations and understanding of many sex problems. It can help strengthen family life in America."* Perhaps it is fortunate that the author of this tribute was not called on to document the steps whereby these highly desirable goals are to be obtained. I find it impossible to believe that a book whose entire focus is on sexual performance, with no reference to attitudes, goals, values, life plans, and the individual's total integration, can conceivably be used to further any of these ends.

A reasonable careful reading of the volume on female sexual behaviour leaves the inescapable impression that Kinsey and his associates have learned very little, if anything, in the intervening years about psychoanalysis and psychiatry. This can only be regretted, since consultation with any reasonably competent analyst would certainly have prevented them from repeating many errors, and from making the superficial explanations in which the book abounds. To take but a few examples, it is apparent that Kinsey is still looking to his data for confirmation or negation of the now almost universally accepted Freudian concept of pre-genital sexuality. That it is absolutely impossible for the type of data which he has collected to throw any light whatsoever on this or other phases of psychosexual development is apparently not yet clear to him. In fact, I am not at all certain what exactly Kinsey and his collaborators think the unconscious is, and there is little evidence in the book that he really understands the difference between the conscious and unconscious meanings of people's behaviour. Thus, even in his comment on dreams he fails to indicate any clear understanding of their meaning in modern dynamic terms. For instance, his implied surprise that dreams of pregnancies or of childbirth were reported as "sex dreams" is noteworthy; but perhaps more especially his comment that "it is more likely

they consider their pregnancy dreams as sexual simply because they know intellectually that there is a relationship between sexual behaviour and reproduction" seems to me a truly amazing statement in 1853. To be sure, he adds gratuitously, "There are still other possible explanations in psychiatric theory." There is no mention, in his consideration of dreams, of the real distinction between the manifest and latent content of the dream, or that dream work is much more complicated than a mere recognition of the element of repressed desires in dreams would indicate. An equally surprising statement about dreams is the following:

"On the other hand, some of these dreams represent activities like rape, which the individual may not desire and of which she may actually be afraid. It seems reasonable to believe that some of these dreams are nightmares rather than anything which the females would welcome either in or out of sleep."

Which suggests to me that Kinsey and his associates must think dreams are as simple as the child's dream of going to a circus or of being prevented from attending school because of big lions surrounding the house. It should be added that even such dreams obviously have meaning at many levels other than the simple expression of an unfulfilled wish. I am sure that any competent analyst could easily have set Kinsey and his group straight about this, had they the desire or willingness to learn.

To take another example. In discussing the nature of factors affecting orgasm, Kinsey says:

"Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists, on the other hand, have centred their attention on the background of the responding female, her subconscious (*sic*) motivation and the sources of her inhibitions. They minimise the significance of the stimuli in the immediate situation and sometimes imply that all individuals would be equally capable of sexual response if their early experience had been uniform. In any attempt to analyse the factors which account for the considerable variation which exists in female responses to orgasm, it is imperative that we consider these three groups of factors: the stimuli, the capacity of the responding individual, and the nature and extent of the individual's previous experience."

In the first place, one needs to point out that these are not ideas general to psychiatrists and clinical psychologists (in this connection Kinsey does not include the psychoanalysts explicitly); secondly, there is no hint of the commanding importance of unconscious motivation and conflicts, unless, of course, Kinsey means to imply that the "nature and extent of the individual's previous experience" has had a fundamental influence on the individual's unconscious. I rather doubt that this was meant, however, and think that here again he has simply excluded the unconscious from consideration.

One more example must suffice. In a discussion of *graffiti* (making inscriptions of various sorts on walls of buildings, etc.) Kinsey says:

"But whatever the conscious intent of the subscriber, the wall inscriptions provide information on the extent and nature of the suppressed sexual desires of females and males . . . This means that the males who make the inscriptions, and the males who read them, are exposing their unsatisfied desires . . . Most of the males who make them would not so openly express their erotic interests in places where they could be identified . . . Comparisons of the female and male inscriptions epitomise, therefore, some of the most basic sexual differences between females and males."

This is a statement which can only be characterised as naïve to the extreme, showing no knowledge of the unconscious meaning of these inscriptions or apparently not recognising that the very fact of indulging in this sort of behaviour is already a sign of a distortion of the personality, and that it would be venturesome indeed to think that comparisons of these inscriptions epitomise basic sexual differences.

Sex and Total Behaviour

However, as a psychiatrist my complaint about the book is hardly limited to these defects in the authors' knowledge of a difficult technical field outside the range of their previous education and experience. The most important and basic lack in these studies is Kinsey's failure to deal with sex in the larger context of human behaviour, and his insistence on trying to understand it as though it existed without any

relationship to the goals, values, ambitions, hopes and desires of people. Perhaps nowhere is this more apparent than in his effort to deal with the effect of religious upbringing on sexual behaviour. Since Kinsey's entire emphasis is on the incidence and outlets of sexual behaviour, especially the "total outlets," and since he believes that the goal should be to allow more and more such outlets for all people as a step to their achieving what he conceives of as a normal sexual life, he considers the effect of a social institution like religion as though it were principally responsible for sexual repression and had no other values which are of such importance as to transcend entirely this one aspect of its influence. This attitude is inevitable in anyone who uses, as he does, a purely atomistic approach to behaviour, which, however suitable to entomology, is only a source of error in dealing with humans.

This also results in his need to separate sex from love, tenderness, concern with the feelings and needs of one's partner, ability, or in fact, eagerness to conform with those feelings and needs, etc., etc., although it is now generally recognised among psychiatrists and analysts that such a separation of the genital from other aspects of one's sexual attitudes and satisfactions itself represents an abnormality in individuals. As a matter of fact, it is part of our elementary teaching of medical students and young psychiatrists to emphasise that the understanding of an individual's sexual behaviour must go much further and deeper than a mere estimate of their genital (or orgasmic) adequacy, and that the sexual life of an individual is only to be understood in terms of his relationship with the partner, its effect on the total life scheme, the presence and absence of appropriate feelings towards the partner, especially those usually included in the term love, etc.

As long as one follows Kinsey in making the maximum sexual expression a goal for people without reference to the emotional cost or to the effect on other aspects of the individual's life plan, such distortions in understanding are inevitable. Sexuality can never be considered profitably apart from the general human context in which it occurs, and from the totality of the individual's behaviour. As a matter of fact, this is a misunderstanding common to many of the so-called self-instruction books on sex, which in general put all their emphasis on techniques, positions, frequency, type of erogenous

zone, utilised in sexual relations, etc., and almost inevitably leave out any sensible consideration of all the other values that are involved in an individual's sexual life. The Kinsey Report is unquestionably much more influential than any of these books in encouraging people to adopt a purely mechanistic concept of sex, since it is "scientific," and for the masses of people there still is a tremendous aura of believability and acceptance of what passes as science.

Kinsey's concept of normalcy also seems to have remained unchanged, and his preference for the use of a statistical frequency concept remains. This type of definition is, of course, commonly used; such biological functions as height, weight, etc., are usually plotted on a curve of statistical variants. However, it is questionable if such definitions can suitably be used to estimate normality of such a complicated set of variables as is subsumed under "sexual behaviour." A usable concept of normality must take into consideration the working arrangement between personal needs and social conditions, and adjustment must be considered in terms other than the place an individual occupies on a statistical curve. A familiar example of the questionable results that occur in the use of the concept of the statistical norm is the common cold, which considered in terms of frequency alone would have to be considered normal. A similar example can be found in the case of voting behaviour in our country. Since only about one-half of the population exercises its privilege to vote, non-voting would be as "normal" in a statistical sense as voting. It is pertinent to remark that, as pointed out by Jahoda in the latter example, one may assume that the different types of distribution of behaviour result, in part, from differential responses to the pressures for conformity.

Having commented on this report in such critical terms, I would like to say again that there is unquestioned value in the raw material which Kinsey presents and that it is not to be concluded from these remarks that I believe there is no worth or merit in this continuing study. Perhaps I can say quite sincerely that it is only because I feel there is such great potential in this study that I venture to protest against his apparent refusal to make use of a large body of very important and basic scientific data available from psychiatry and psychoanalysis. Practically every reviewer of the first volume hoped that Kinsey would correct these errors before the second volume had

appeared. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that the repetition of such comments will persuade him and his co-workers to avail themselves of this help, which I am sure would be freely available to him from the most competent and experienced sources.

Kinsey—sexological unitarian

SO NOBLE
AN EFFORT CORRUPTED

Iago Galdston, M.D.

IAGO GALDSTON's professional experience embraces clinical medicine, psychiatry, and public health. He is currently secretary of the Medical Information Bureau of the New York Academy of Medicine, chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the American Psychiatric Association, and co-editor of *Excerpta Medica*, section on Neurology and Psychiatry. He is the author of a number of books and numerous articles in the professional and lay Press, dealing with medical history, social medicine, and psychiatry.

For ten years Dr. Galdston taught at New York University, on the behaviour problems of children, and he also served for a time as the Professor of Public Health at Fordham University, downtown division. Born in Russia, he came to the United States as a child, got his undergraduate and professional education in this country, and did postgraduate work in Europe.

SO NOBLE AN EFFORT CORRUPTED

Iago Galdston

There is a saying in Russian that when a bear dances the wonder is not how well he dances—but that he dances at all. Something of this wonder is inherent in Kinsey's book, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*. Whatever may be said in criticism or challenge, we must still deem it a wonder and an abiding credit to its senior author and his associates. It stands out as a courageous and informed challenge to all the salacious bigotry which, for some two thousand years, has sought, and has largely succeeded in, blocking the objective study and sober comprehension of the patterns of sexual behaviour among humans. It affirms—and few works have done it as well—that the proper study of Mankind is man—woman included.

In addition, this work has an excellent and embrasive bibliography and reference list, as well as notations on many phases of sexology, ranging from relevant citations from the Old and New Testaments to the bizarre and benighted laws with which some of our sovereign states attempt to bolster "virtue" and to punish sexual transgressions. Viewed as an informative book, distinct and apart from the opinions it advances and the judgments it propounds, this Kinsey Report is a monumental contribution to our knowledge of sexual behaviour among humans. Our own generation, and many generations to come, will be the debtors of Kinsey and his associates, and of "the nearly 8,000 females who contributed the data on which this book is based"—and to whom it is fittingly dedicated.

Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female is popularly referred to as the Kinsey Report on Females. Perhaps if it had been just that and nothing more it would have been better. But this work is more than the report of a survey. In addition to presenting the demographic data on sexual behaviour in the human female, and deducing from these data many

primary and secondary correlations, Kinsey ventures many opinions and judgments bearing upon sexology, psychiatry, sociology, and law. Even the most sympathetic reading of the book, in the full latitude of tolerance for passion and over-emphasis due to the initiator and pioneer, cannot wipe out the conviction that the further from his primary figures Kinsey ventures, the less trustworthy and dependable he becomes. Indeed, some of his excursions are so very disconcerting that one is impelled to wish that "the shoemaker had stuck to his last." It is painful to see so noble an effort corrupted by so many ill-advised presumptions.

Kinsey's blunders are most serious when he ventures into the realm of psychiatry. The work reverberates with the overtones of his "grudge" against psychiatrists, notably the Freudians. He appears to be unable to appreciate the subtleties of psychiatric theory and doctrines. Kinsey is a "sexological unitarian." His singular concern is with sex, independent of all related matters. And in sex, he considers orgasm to be the *summum bonum*. The sexual function, however, does not operate independently. It is influenced by an infinite number of factors and forces, which collectively constitute the individual's reality world. Woe to the individual who functions, sexually or otherwise, unmindful of reality. Disaster is more than likely to overtake him. But Kinsey has little esteem for social reality, and thinks it mainly wrong and corrupt. He indulges in specious arguments to bolster and defend his viewpoint; all behaviour, he insists, is material in origin (p. 8).

This is a crude and false postulate. Behaviour is ultimately mediated by, and manifested in matter. But certainly it may be socially determined. On his original premise, Kinsey proclaims his "right to investigate." This no one would deny him. What may be challenged, however, are the conclusions he draws from his findings. Anticipating such an objection, he draws the analogy of the dieticians and biochemists who might be denied the right to analyse foods and the processes of nutrition because the eating of certain foods has been considered a matter for religious regulation. But all this is beside the point. Dieticians and biochemists may analyse to their hearts' content, and no one is likely to object, unless they presume to legislate on our eating habits, or to offer an interpretation of the Eucharist.

It is quite true, as Kinsey affirms, that "no theory, no

philosophy, no body of theology, no political expediency, no wishful thinking, can provide a satisfactory substitute for the observation of material objects and the way which they behave" (p. 8). Granted! But what Kinsey would have us believe, at least by implication, is that the observation of material objects and their behaviour *does* provide a satisfactory substitute for philosophy, theology, political expediency, and for what he terms "wishful thinking"—but which, in effect, is often the source of poetry, of art, and of idealism.

It is this order of what may be termed logistic obtuseness that permits Kinsey to misconceive and to criticise Freud's concept of latency. The decline in pre-adolescent sex-play observed in youngsters was never attributed by Freud to biological factors. The normal pre-adolescent ceases to be preoccupied with himself partly because of social pressure, but more so because he has discovered, and is prompted to explore, the world around him. Similarly, the thumb-sucking child finds consolation and pleasure in this pattern of self-gratification, but in due time he willingly gives up sucking his finger for the multiform pleasures of touching and handling objects. The child who persists in sucking his thumb beyond due time is in need of clinical study.

Freud's theories on human sexuality were psycho-socially oriented. Eros was not the sole God in the Freudian Pantheon. Eros, the cosmic force which creates life, is linked with Logos, the rational, informing and controlling principle. Freud spoke of the *superego*—and of the *id*. Kinsey is cognisant of the *id*, but he seems to look upon the *superego* as the malignant artifact of a senile and malevolent society. In his judgment, the old folk are not the experienced and loving guardians of the young, but crotchety and dessicated souls who are increasingly unable to understand the sexual capacities of youth. In witness, Kinsey cites the great romances of history—Achilles and Deidamia, Acis and Galatea, Helen and Paris, Daphnis and Chloe, Heloise and Abelard, Tristram and Isolde, Romeo and Juliet. These great lovers of history, he points out, were teen-age boys and girls. He overlooks the fact that they were all tragic characters, whose romances yielded death and disaster.

Kinsey is similarly confused when he comments on the Freudian view that adults who masturbate are "infantile, immature, and exhibit a personality defect which merits psychia-

tric attention." (p. 170). Seemingly, Kinsey knows of "many adults who are not immature in any realistic (sic) sense," who do masturbate. There is no science, he says, in refusing to recognise this fact. Kinsey does not define what he means by "any realistic sense." Indeed, the entire criticism of this Freudian viewpoint, which viewpoint is widely shared by psychiatrists, is rich in spleen and poor in sense. Freud did not intend the occasional, or the non-compulsive masturbator. He had in mind the individual to whom heterosexual relations were possible and available but who, for neurotic reasons, preferred to masturbate. Such an individual is infantile and immature, at least in his sexual behaviour.

One of Kinsey's obsessive convictions is that pre-marital experience in orgasm favours the female's effective sexual performance in marriage. On the general principle that "he who starts earliest is likely to arrive the soonest," his argument presents a semblance of plausibility. But then, one is moved to ask, why shouldn't he who starts a little later also arrive in due time? What magic is there in pre-marital coitus that is missing in the legitimatised act? Why can't the female learn as well by the one as by the other? Kinsey offers a simple answer: "the girl who has spent her pre-marital years withdrawing from physical contacts . . . has acquired a set of nervous and muscular co-ordinations which she does not unlearn easily after marriage" (p. 172). This, of course, leaves unexplained the reasons why she spent her pre-marital years withdrawing from physical contacts. The reasons remaining—would orgasm be possible, and if possible, would the untoward nervous and muscular co-ordinations be undone? Here Kinsey, as in many other instances, bogs down in circular reasoning. This is the inescapable resultant of his basic assumption that what an individual does sexually depends on the nature of the provoking stimulus, on the individual's physical and physiological capacities, and on his previous experience with similar stimuli. This is a mechanistic, reflexological hypothesis, lacking in psychological, sociological, and cultural insight and depth.

Kinsey does not specify how far a girl needs to withdraw from physical contact to suffer dire consequences, nor how close the contact need be in order to escape them. The fact is, he could not really venture a valid judgment, for the problem is vastly more complicated than he will allow. Yet he does

not escape its complexity, and in elaborating upon it he is obliged to shift the emphasis of his arguments and, at times, he gainsays in effect what he had said before.

Statistics show that more than twice as many women (forty-four per cent) who had no previous experience with orgasm as those who had (nineteen per cent), failed to reach orgasm in the first year of marriage. On the basis of these statistical data, Kinsey ventures the judgment that "it is doubtful if any therapy [*sic*] has ever been as effective as early experience in orgasm, in reducing the incidences of unresponsiveness in marital coitus, and in increasing the frequencies of response to orgasm in that coitus" (p. 386). This is an unequivocal statement. But the question promptly arises—did the women who had pre-marital experience with orgasm have the experience because they had an innate drive and capacity for orgasm, or did they acquire a competence in orgasm because of their pre-marital experience? Looking at the statistical data cited, it is noteworthy that fifty-six per cent of the women without pre-marital experience did succeed in achieving orgasm during the first year of marriage. Kinsey isn't sure—maybe the "therapy" isn't sovereign after all. The selective factor as well as the experiential factor may be operative here. Later he affirms that "in general, it seems probable that selective factors are more often responsible" (p. 388).

The entire work is coloured by the author's conviction that experience with pre-marital orgasm, preferably in coitus, is the most promising *therapy* for successful sexual performance in marriage. There is the ring of regret and lamentation in his observation; so many of our American youth, both females and males, depend upon masturbation instead of coitus as a pre-marital outlet (p. 14). Kinsey does not differentiate, as most psychiatrists do, between the highly desirable "erotisation" of the individual, and the socially and psychologically premature initiation of full heterosexual activity. That is in part due to Kinsey's persuasion that, unless sexual interest or play terminates in orgasm, it is inadequate and frustrating—a persuasion supported neither by experience nor by psychiatry.

Basically, as has been indicated before, Kinsey contemplates the sexual function quite as on a par with any other function of the organism, such as eating or defecating. It is pleasurable—hence it is good. Anything that limits or circumscribes it must be looked upon with suspicion. He seemingly applauds

the Lepcha, a primitive people, among whom "sexual activity is practically divorced from emotion; it is a pleasant and amusing experience, and as such a necessity as food and drink; and like food and drink it does not matter from whom you receive it, as long as you get it . . ." (p. 413). This description also fits some of our most neurotically sick individuals, those who are promiscuous and loveless. Kinsey is certain that the human male objects to his wife's extra-marital coitus because he wants to maintain "his property rights in his female mate." It is all a matter of "mammalian heritage."

In Kinsey's scheme of things there seems to be little room for love, for devotion, for a sense of obligation, and for such goals and ambitions, to say nothing of ideals as may override our "mammalian heritage," and more than compensate for primal urges left unsatisfied. How little he has these other phases of human life in mind is reflected in the following comment, which is as naïve as it is blasé and erroneous: "To most males," Kinsey writes, "the desire for variety in sexual activity seems as reasonable as the desire for variety in the books that one reads, the music that one hears, the recreations in which one engages, and the friends with whom one associates socially" (p. 409). All this is sheer nonsense. It is Kinsey's viewpoint, and not that of most males. Most males, and females too, are not that much preoccupied with sex. They find that there are other things in life besides, things to which sex is ancillary, things by which and in which they find fulfilment, things such as a home and children, friends, work and the community. That, indeed, is the great weakness and the deficiency in Kinsey other than statistical expositions: he treats sex out of its vital context, as if it were a thing apart from all the rest of man's functions. Despite his numerous objections to Freudian and psychoanalytic formulations, he has not grasped this fundamental Freudian idea that inadequate sexual function is the witness to and the product of neurosis, and not the reverse. Indoctrination in techniques, and the simple exercise of a libertine pattern of behaviour, offers no assurance of happy and effective living.

Kinsey, of course, does not advocate libertinism. He doesn't "advocate" anything. He allows his figures to do that for him. But his figures are like puppets, and he pulls the strings. The necessity to be so critical of Kinsey's book is a painful but inescapable obligation. The spirit in which the book is

written is laudable. Surely we need to be better informed on everything that pertains to sex and the sexual function. This is a field studded with bigotry, intolerances, ignorance, and vicious misinformation. In many respects—and the psychiatrists are perhaps most aware of it—our attitudes on sexuality and on a variety of sexual practices need to be liberalised. But such changes as are advocated and effected must fit into the larger scheme of things, the scheme which includes the family and society. The orgasm is “not a thing in itself.” Viewed teleologically, it is but one link in the chain that binds the eternity of the past with that of the future. That the orgasm may be experienced outside of and apart from the act of procreation does not alter its significance in the totality of life’s experience. Man is related to the mammalian world, but he is not governed by his “mammalian heritage.”

Society has blundered widely and often in inhibiting the free exercise of man’s faculties and the pursuits of his appetites. But, as Freud so ably demonstrated, much of what is most precious and enduring in society and in culture is the resultant of man’s competence and willingness to sublimate some portion of the primal drives, sex included.

Biologic—psychologic—sociologic—

THE THREE FEMALES

Bernard Barber

BERNARD BARBER teaches sociology at Barnard College, and in the Graduate School of Columbia University. He is the author of *Science and the Social Order*, which has been published both in the United States and in England, and is now at work on a book which will be a systematic theoretical and factual survey of social stratification. Dr. Barber has also published a number of articles and reviews in professional journals, on subjects such as messianic movements among the North American Indians, sociological theory, and American women's fashions.

During World War II. Dr. Barber served for four years in the Navy, as an officer aboard a heavy cruiser in the Pacific, and as a lend-lease liaison officer with the British in Africa and Asia. He has both a bachelor's degree and a doctorate from Harvard, and has also taught at Harvard and at Smith College.

THE THREE FEMALES

Bernard Barber

It is one of the fundamental scientific virtues of the magnificent Kinsey Report on Women that it treats sexual behaviour as the behavioural response of the total human individual. Kinsey often speaks of sexual relationships as "socio-sexual relationships" (e.g., p. 641). He readily acknowledges "... the biologic, psychologic, and social factors which account for sexual responses in the female" (p. 251). In regard to every kind of human sexual behaviour, Kinsey analyses the biological determinants in great detail, the social determinants somewhat less so, and the psychological determinants least of all—although the Report on Women is more psychological than was the Report on Men. Kinsey's approach to sexual behaviour is in accord with the basic assumption of modern social science that *all* human behaviour must be seen in its three inherent and inter-related aspects—the biological, the psychological, and the social.

Nevertheless, there remains a strong biologicistic overtone, almost a bias, in the Kinsey Report on Women. This overtone comes through in several different ways. For one thing, Kinsey constantly compares the different kinds of sexual behaviour in women with similar behaviour in the infra-human mammalian species, without ever saying explicitly that there are essential differences as well as essential similarities between humans and animals. As a consequence, what could be a useful analogy seems to be an intended identity that does not exist. For another thing, in his comparison of female and male humans, Kinsey gives much the most consideration to biological factors. Three out of four comparative chapters deal with the anatomic, the neural, and the hormonal factors in sexual response. The fourth deals with "psychologic factors," though in a way that would not be entirely satisfactory to psychological scientists. There is no chapter at all on the social factors, though consideration of these is scattered throughout many chapters.

Indeed, it is this very constant comparison of male with female that contributes to the biologicistic overtone of the Kinsey Report on Women. For most readers, as to Kinsey, apparently, "male" and "female" are essentially biological, rather than *also* psychological and social categories. That these are *more than* biological categories, we can see when we note how much difference there is in female behaviour in different societies, and so also in male behaviour in different societies. The anthropological evidence on this score is so weighty that it cannot be ignored. Moreover, even in our own society, as Kinsey documents beyond doubt, there is a great deal of individual variation in sexual behaviour. Kinsey's constant implication, however, is that this variation is due to biological variation. Kinsey presents evidence for the social determinants of variation in men, e.g., class, religious, and educational factors; and he gives some, though less, evidence for social variation in women. But all too seldom does he compare the social variations in men with those in women, to see in what social respects they are similar, and in what respects they are different. Only in this way could he effectively compare the *relative* influences of biological and social factors, apart from whether the humans are male or female. We may hope that Kinsey will make social as well as biological comparisons more explicitly in his future Reports. This might make it possible to discover, for example, that certain social categories of women are more like certain social categories of men than they are like other social categories of women. Kinsey has not put his assertion that "females are not conditioned to the extent that males are conditioned by the attitudes of the social groups in which they live" (p. 686) to a decisive test.

Unfortunately, the biologicistic overtone in the Kinsey Report on Women is not merely an implicit one. There is an explicit inconsistency or confusion in Kinsey's treatment of the relations among biological, psychological, and social factors in sexual behaviour that is at the heart of his biologicistic tendency. On the one hand, he can say that there is no "anatomic or physiologic basis" for the "supposed differences between female and male sexuality" (p. 641), and this on the basis of a minute consideration of the matter in chapter fifteen. Or again, in the same vein, he says, "Nothing we know about the anatomy or physiology of sexual response, or about the relative significance of psychologic stimuli in females and males,

would account for these differences in the development of sexual responsiveness, and for these differences in the ageing patterns of the two sexes" (p. 715). Because he is so careful a biological scientist, Kinsey's critique of the hormonal theory of personality (in chapter eighteen) is as effective as it could possibly be.

On the other hand, however, he can be inconsistently and needlessly biologicistic. Thus, when he discovers that the number of nocturnal dreams resulting in orgasm has not increased among women over the last forty to sixty years, he says, "If psychosexual development in the female were socially controlled, as it is ordinarily believed to be, we might have expected more change in the incidences and frequencies of nocturnal dreams over this period of years" (p. 202). He makes this statement against social determinants of sexual response even though he himself presents evidence to show that *over the same period of time* the *nine other* kinds of sexual response, he examines have *all* changed. Increasingly more women in America over the last forty to sixty years, Kinsey has found, are having the experience of pre-adolescent sex-play; are masturbating; are petting to orgasm; are engaging in deep kissing, in mouth-breast and mouth-genital contacts; are having pre-marital coitus; are having orgasm in marital coitus; and are having extra-marital coitus. Lack of change in one kind of sexual behaviour and the occurrence of change in nine others cannot be due simply to biological factors. Variable changes of this kind are a specific mandate to research into the psychological and social *co-determinants* of sexual behaviour.

Above all things, in the analysis of human behaviour of any kind we must free ourselves of the biologicistic fallacy. All human behaviour has three inherent and inter-related aspects: the biological, the psychological, and the social. We must seek to discover the *relative share* of influence that each has on any given kind of human behaviour. This relative share will vary for different kinds of behaviour, though no aspect will ever be totally unimportant. To see that the psychological and social aspects are significant is not to deny the biological influence. We must, of course, avoid also the psychologistic and sociologistic fallacies. The biological, the psychological, and the social aspects of man's behaviour interwork from birth, even from conception, onwards. Society alone makes it pos-

sible for man to realise his biological nature. Without society, as Hobbes showed so well, there would be only the war of all against all, and there would be no ordered sexual or any other kind of human behaviour.

Four Considerations

Because of the biologicistic overtone in the Kinsey Report on Women, it would perhaps be helpful to set forth some of the social co-determinants of some patterns of sexual behaviour in American women discovered in that volume. Wherever possible, we shall use the scattered and under-emphasised social interpretations that can be culled from the Kinsey Report itself. Three patterns will be discussed here: the lesser sexuality of women, the lesser sexual promiscuity of women, and the lesser psychological responsiveness of women. In addition, it may be useful to discuss another matter, namely, the moral dilemma of the scientific expert who knows that his work will have social consequences over which he can have only a small amount of control. Dr. Kinsey, like all scientists whose discoveries have immediate social usefulness, is now face to face with this moral dilemma. He cannot avoid it, we shall see, not only because of his expressed moral obligation to society, but also because of its effects upon his own scientific research.

The lesser sexuality of women: The Kinsey Report on Women finds that the incidence (number of women) and frequency (number of times) of both various specific kinds of sexual behaviour, and what Kinsey calls "total outlet," are less in his sample of women than in his sample of men. As we have seen above, Kinsey himself says that biological science does not yet know of any anatomic, physiological (including hormonal), or neural factors to explain the lesser sexuality of women, though eventually such biological co-determinants may be discovered. What is a possible social co-determinant? The answer to this question is simple, perhaps obvious, but nonetheless important. The adverse personal and social consequences to the unmarried and married woman, to her family, and to her society from illegitimate sexual activities, especially when there is the danger of illegitimate birth, but including those that hinder socially desirable hetero-sexual relations,

are very much greater than the woman, her family, and society are able or willing to suffer. Hence the greater sexual supervision and protectiveness for women in all societies. Hence also the different, and the more asexual upbringing that women are given. It is no wonder that lesser sexuality results from lesser knowledge about sex and greater protectiveness over women. In a moment we shall look at some evidence that Kinsey gives showing how women are systematically *trained and protected* to a lower rate of sexual behaviour than men.

A series of scattered statements and bits of evidence in the Kinsey Report support this social interpretation of the lesser sexuality of women. For example, after pointing out that in all societies some pre-marital pregnancies occur, Kinsey says: "Attempts to control such pregnancies and to provide that children should have responsible parents were undoubtedly factors of considerable moment in the development of society's interest in controlling coitus outside of wedlock" (p. 326). In fact, even in the volume on men, Kinsey had said: "Society is interested in maintaining the family as a means for providing homes for children that result from coitus. . . . Society is also interested in maintaining families as a means of providing a regular sexual outlet for adults, and as a means of controlling promiscuous sexual activity" (p. 563, Male volume). Because they bear the children, women have had to "pay the price" for these familial and social necessities.

We can see the significance of these social necessities all the more clearly by noting that societies usually treat the very same sexual behaviour more or less leniently, depending upon the social consequences. For example, pre-marital and extra-marital coitus that does not result in unwanted pregnancies is treated more leniently than such coitus that does. Even in societies that are much freer than ours about pre-marital coitus, there is still an essential social control over pre-marital sexual activity. That is, pre-marital coitus is approved only on condition that if conception occurs, the couple will marry and care for the child. There is, in this situation, a kind of "trial marriage." Nor is this situation completely different from one kind of social situation in our own society. Several careful studies have shown that a large percentage of American children are born less than nine months after the date of marriage. Conception has occurred before the marriage, often when the marriage was already firmly intended, and then has

led to the marriage ceremony itself. The difference between our society and a few others is not so much in what actually occurs, as in the degree of publicity and approval that accompany pre-marital sex behaviour. There is evidence for this in the Kinsey Report. Nearly fifty per cent of Kinsey's sample had had pre-marital coitus. But, he says: much of this coitus had been confined to the fiancé just before marriage. There is, therefore, Kinsey continues, "some inclination, even in groups that consider all non-marital coitus wrong, to make some allowance for pre-marital coitus which is had with the subsequent spouse" (p. 293).

The same kind of differential treatment occurs in the case of extra-marital coitus, especially for the male. Here again we can discover a good social interpretation in the Kinsey Report. Most societies, Dr. Kinsey says, "permit or condone extra-marital coitus for the male if he is reasonably circumspect about it, and if he does not carry it to extremes which would break up his home, lead to any neglect of his family, outrage his in-laws, stir up public scandal, or start difficulties with the husbands or other relatives of the women with whom he has his extra-marital relationships . . . (there is) a covert toleration of occasional lapses if social difficulties do not arise from such acts" (p. 414).

Now perhaps we can see a little more clearly that differences in the sexual behaviour of men and women result partly from differences in their social roles, and in the consequences of these social roles for themselves, their families, and their society. In so far as women's sexual behaviour has changed over the last forty to sixty years in America, it has changed partly because their social roles are changing, and because the social consequences of their sexual behaviour have changed. These matters we shall examine further below. We need only add here that so long as men and women do have different parts to play in society, their sexual behaviour is likely to be different. It is in this area of the influence of social and correlative psychological differences between men and women on their sexual behaviour that we need a great deal of research.

Given the fact that different sexual behaviour in women is socially necessary, how does it come about that they are properly trained for their socio-sexual roles? As with all other kinds of human behaviour, the appropriate sexual behaviour (or the appropriate lack of sexual behaviour) is learned in the

family, from playmates and friends, in the church, and in the school. Scattered through the Kinsey Report are valuable assertions and bits of evidence that bear on the way in which women's sexual behaviour is partly the result of social training.

We may start with a striking piece of evidence. "Among infant females," says Kinsey, "the incidences of response and completed orgasm were about as high as they were among infant males" (p. 511). This infant identity between males and females suggests very strongly that sexuality starts equally and then is partly trained out of girls and trained into, or not so actively discouraged, among boys. Training starts early. At very early ages, as Kinsey says, attitudes to nudity, to anatomic differences, to the reproductive function, to sex talk, and to the qualities which our culture traditionally considers desirable for females or males, are developed (p. 16). Parents treat girls quite differently from boys, both in the home, and with respect to their freedom outside the home. To protect girls from boys, not only against actual sexual contact but against just learning sexual information as well, parents place restrictions on the free intermingling of even small children of different sexes. That this restriction is effective we may see in Kinsey's evidence on the ways in which males and females learn about masturbation. For pre-adolescent males, observation of other children engaged in masturbation or deliberate instruction by an older child or adult is the most usual way of learning about the possibility and techniques of masturbation. Females, however, both in the pre-adolescent and later years, learn to masturbate by discovering the possibility of this activity entirely on their own (p. 107). As Kinsey says, this self-discovery of masturbation "provides striking evidence of the ignorance which is frequent among females of sexual activities which are outside of their own experience . . . It is obvious that neither younger girls nor older women discuss their sexual experience in the open way that males do" (p. 138). It is society that creates these different opportunities for learning and practice between men and women.

As the girl approaches puberty, in which personally and socially harmful sexual behaviour is more possible and more dangerous, the parents increase their protectiveness over her sexual knowledge and practice. They increasingly limit her free play with boys. They may warn against kissing, genital exposures, and sexual relationships. "The cessation of pre-

adolescent sex-play in the later pre-adolescent years," Kinsey says, "was taken by Freud . . . to represent a period of sexual latency. On the contrary, it seems to be a period of inactivity which is imposed upon the socio-sexual activities of a maturing child, especially if the child is a female" (p. 115). A social class difference in these control patterns can be noted. While all social classes seek to control the sex knowledge and practice of the young female, the higher class groups are, for a variety of reasons, more effective in achieving it. Kinsey finds, in consequence, that because of "social restraints and parental supervision," girls under twenty in the better-educated groups have less pre-marital coitus than girls in the less well-educated groups. Thirty-eight per cent of the grade school group, and only seventeen to nineteen per cent of the college-educated group in his sample had had pre-marital coitus before age twenty (p. 296).

One other social situation provides training in sexual behaviour for the female, and that is marriage itself. The Kinsey Report provides excellent data on the socio-sexual learning that occurs in marriage. Nearly half of the women in his sample had experienced orgasm in the first month of marriage. Within the first six months the figure had increased to sixty-seven per cent; within the first year, to seventy-five per cent. The learning process then slows up, but still continues, and by the fifteenth year of marriage, nearly ninety per cent have experienced orgasm. The percentage of women reaching orgasm in all or nearly all their marital coitus also rises steadily from the beginning of marriage onwards. "These data," says Kinsey, "provide impressive evidence that experience and psychologic reconditioning may, in the course of time, improve the ability of the female to respond to the point of orgasm in her marital coitus" (p. 383). What is inappropriate learning and behaviour before marriage becomes appropriate afterwards. In both of these social situations, we see the tremendous influence of social training on sexual behaviour.

There is one final way in which we can see the social co-determinants of sexual behaviour in American women. This is by describing the changes that have occurred in the last forty to sixty years, as women's social roles have changed. As Kinsey says, "the decade of birth has proved to be one of the most significant social items correlating with the patterns of sexual behaviour among American females" (p. 55). We have

seen above that over the last forty to sixty years, increasingly more women are having the experience of pre-adolescent sex-play; are masturbating; are petting to orgasm; are engaging in deep kissing, in mouth-breast and mouth-genital contacts; are having pre-marital coitus; are having orgasm in marital coitus; and are having extra-marital coitus. There is not sufficient space here to go into all the social changes that have resulted in different social roles for women and, therefore, in different sexual behaviour. Kinsey mentions several social factors causing this change in sexual behaviour: "changes in attitudes" (p. 299); "developing emancipation of the female, and especially of the unmarried female in our American culture" (p. 299); "increased knowledge of contraception" (p. 300); and "an increase in the proportion of persons living under the greater anonymity provided by urban centres" (p. 300). Perhaps we can say that, *indirectly*, changes in women's sexual behaviour are partly the result of inter-related changes in *every part of our society and culture*, and that, *directly*, the changes in female sex behaviour have been influenced most by increased knowledge and practice of contraception. By diminishing the danger of illegitimate births and of sterility resulting from sexual contact with diseased persons, contraception has changed the whole personal and social situation in which sexual behaviour occurs. But this is just a partial, crude explanation. More and more research is necessary into the social factors that are co-determinants of sexual behaviour in men and women, in the young and old, in the upper class and the lower class, in the well-educated and the poorly-educated, and in the religiously indifferent and the religiously devout.

The lesser sexual promiscuity of women: The Kinsey Report on Women finds that women are less sexually promiscuous than men; that is, they have fewer partners in pre-marital petting, pre-marital coitus, extra-marital coitus, and in homosexual relationships. Here again, the overtone implies some biologic difference. But from what we have said about the lesser sexuality of women, we can see that much of the lesser promiscuity is due to the social controls over women's sexuality in general. Men's greater promiscuity is partly the result of greater opportunity, and this opportunity is socially created. For example, men more often travel in the interests of their work, and this travel not only separates them from

family and friends but from the social controls over their promiscuity. Especially in recent times we have seen an increase in male promiscuity resulting from service in the armed forces, both in the United States and other countries. Sometimes the socially created difference in promiscuity is more specific. Consider the case of homosexuality. In our society, it is very much more subject to moral disapproval for men to live together than it is for women. Two women may be presumed to be living together for mutual protection against male depredations. Consequently, it is possible for women to live together and share a long-continued homosexual relationship. This is nearly impossible for men, even for those that might prefer a stable homosexual relationship. Hence the greater homosexual promiscuity of men. Kinsey's data showed "a fair number of histories in which the homosexual partners had lived together and maintained regular sexual relationships for many years . . . Such long-time homosexual associations are rare among males. A steady association between two females is much more acceptable to our culture and it is, in consequence, a simpler matter for females to continue relationships for some period of years" (p. 456). Women are very much less often arrested for homosexuality than are men. This is partly because it is hard to detect homosexuality where two women are "normally" living together. There is much less approval of men living "normally" together. Here again, then, we see how there are social co-determinants of the forms and frequencies of sexual behaviour.

The lesser psychological responsiveness of women: The Kinsey Report on Women finds that, "In general, males are more often conditioned by their sexual experience, and by a greater variety of associated factors, than females. . . . The average female is less often affected by such psychologic factors. It is highly significant to find that there are evidences of such differences between the females and males of infra-human mammalian species, as well as between human females and males" (p. 649). Once again, it is an anatomic or psychologic basis that is implied as the basis of the supposed psychological difference. In chapter sixteen, which is entirely devoted to psychologic factors in sexual response, there is little consideration of the fact that personality is moulded by social interaction, and that differences in the psychological responsiveness of men

and women might be due to different kinds of social training, by parents, playmates, and teachers. There is this neglect of the social influences on personality, even though Kinsey says, earlier in the book and incidentally to another matter: "The psychologic significance of any type of sexual activity very largely depends upon what the individual and his social group choose to make it" (p. 320). It can be seen that the biologicistic overtone, and confusion on the relationship between the biological, psychological, and social aspects of sexual behaviour pervade the volume.

Let us consider closely the evidence offered for the different psychological responsiveness of men and women. Kinsey gives data on thirty-three types of experience in which he compares the erotic responsiveness of men and women. Among these types of experience are: observing the opposite sex, observing nude figures, observing burlesque and floor shows, observing sexual action, fantasies concerning the opposite sex, diversion during coitus, stimulation by erotic stories, discussions of sex, transvestism (wearing the clothes of the opposite sex), and promiscuity. On three items—seeing movies, being bitten, and reading literary materials—women report themselves more erotically responsive than men. On some others, the percentage of females who respond erotically is only slightly below the percentages of males (p. 687). Only in regard to twelve of these items, the number of females who were erotically aroused was less than half the number of males who were aroused (p. 687). This evidence would seem to indicate pretty clearly that differences in psychological responsiveness between men and women are not of the generalized kind that would be due merely to some anatomic or physiological factors. The evidence shows psychological responsiveness to be both variable and specific—behaviour of the kind that is the product of variable and specific kinds of social training. In no matter of sexual behaviour, whether of form, of emotional meaning, of incidence, or of frequency, can we ignore the social co-determinants.

The moral dilemma of the scientific expert: Quite apart from its limitations, the Kinsey Report on Women, like the Report on Men, remains a magnificent scientific accomplishment that will be, and should be, very widely studied. Millions of people will be influenced by what science, in the person of Dr. Kinsey,

has achieved toward a better understanding of human behaviour. For this reason, Dr. Kinsey finds himself in the moral dilemma that is inevitable for any scientific expert whose work sooner or later comes into public usefulness. The scientist feels that knowledge is an end in itself, but he also recognises the moral obligations he has to society for the consequences he has wrought. Dr. Kinsey says, for example: "It is, moreover, the record of science that greater knowledge, as it has become available, has increased man's capacity to live happily with himself and with his fellow men. We do not believe that the happiness of individual men, and the good of the total social organisation, is ever furthered by the perpetuation of ignorance" (p. 9).

Science, we believe with Dr. Kinsey, is indeed good in the long run, but in the short run the social consequences of any particular scientific discovery may be diverse, may be considered "bad" as well as "good" by different people in the society where these consequences work themselves out. Many people, for example, fear the "bad" consequences of the Kinsey Report for the behaviour of American youth. Of course it is not enough for the scientist simply to disclaim *all* responsibility. Scientists do not generally want to do this, and if they did, they might find themselves condemned as a group of socially dangerous irresponsibles. Scientists who know that the results of their work will affect people for both ill and good usually want to tell the public about these diverse consequences. Or, lacking any precise knowledge of these social consequences, they may want to make some effort to discover what they will be. This is one very large task that still remains for the science of sexual behaviour. Perhaps Dr. Kinsey and his Institute for Sex Research will be interested in this task; perhaps others will take it up. As we acquire more knowledge of human sexual behaviour, we need to know more about the social consequences of that knowledge.

Such knowledge about the consequences of our knowledge is doubly important. We must have it not only because our new knowledge is going to affect other men than the scientists of sexual behaviour; we must have it also because this new knowledge will change the very situation that the scientists are themselves studying. There can be no question that the Kinsey Reports will change the patterns of sexual behaviour in American society. All the more reason why Dr. Kinsey and

his collaborators need to know the consequences of their work. The social scientist (and that is what Dr. Kinsey is, in part) who does not know how his discoveries affect the behaviour he is studying becomes trapped by what Robert K. Merton has called "self-fulfilling prophecies" and "suicidal prophecies." In the former case, that of "self-fulfilling prophecies," the scientist gets the results he predicted partly because he predicts them. As it has been wittily, though inaccurately, said, the Kinsey volume on Men produced the results of the Kinsey volume on Women. In the latter, that of "suicidal prophecies," the scientist fails to get the results he predicted just because his predictions changed people's behaviour. For many reasons, therefore, both in his study of sexual behaviour itself and in his study of the social consequences of his discoveries, Dr. Kinsey needs a more explicit concern for the social, as well as the biological and psychological, aspects of human behaviour.

Absurd Hedonism

KINSEY AND THE MORAL PROBLEM OF MAN'S SEXUAL LIFE

Reinhold Niebuhr, D.D.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, Professor of Applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, is probably the one man in the country best qualified to comment on the Kinsey Reports from the viewpoint of religion. Dr. Niebuhr's leadership in a great many religious and social activities has brought his name into constant prominence in both theological and liberal political circles. He was one of the five members of the U.S. delegation to the fourth session of the General Conference of UNESCO, held in Paris

Dr. Niebuhr is well known as an author and a lecturer. His books on a variety of subjects related to the philosophy of religion include *Faith and History* *Discerning the Signs of the Times*

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness
An Interpretation of Christian Ethics and *Moral Man and Immoral Society* he became the fifth American to be invited to deliver the Gifford lectures at Edinburgh University, where he drew the biggest crowds in Gifford history.

For the past twenty-five years Dr. Niebuhr has been teaching at the Seminary, having been appointed to the professorship in

He was born in Wright City, Missouri, in 1892, the son of a German pastor. he was ordained in the Evangelical Synod of North America, and for the next thirteen years was pastor of the Bethel Evangelical Church in industrial Detroit.

KINSEY AND THE MORAL PROBLEM OF MAN'S SEXUAL LIFE

Reinhold Niebuhr

The findings of the Kinsey Report are not as disturbing as the presuppositions upon which the inquiry into the sexual habits of American females is initiated and the conclusions which Kinsey thinks are prompted by his evidence. The evidence may be disturbing, but it is not surprising, as least to those who have been close to the younger generations and knew that they were freer in their sexual relations than past generations; and that this freedom included both what the young people defined as "heavy petting" and which Kinsey designates as "petting to orgasm," and pre-marital coitus.

Even the degree of extra-marital coitus among females could have been surmised by the differences in the situation after the first and the second World Wars, for according to the testimony of the courts the number of divorces due to adultery on the part of the wife had greatly increased after the second, as compared with the first war. It is, of course, disturbing to find this further evidence of the decay of the family. But Kinsey's rejoicing over the result is more disturbing; as are the ruling presuppositions of his inquiry which prompt his satisfaction.

The basic presupposition is that men and women face a rather purely physiological problem in their sex life. They must find sufficient "outlets" for their sexual urge. The traditional "inhibitions" and restraints must be brushed aside to accomplish this emancipation. The purely physiological approach is related to the conviction that we are dealing merely with the "human animal." Kinsey refers in innumerable instances to analogies between the sex practices of humans and "infra-human mammals" without once calling attention to uniquely human characteristics in man's sexual life, except the purely physiological one that he can use his hands for purposes of erotic arousal. The obvious and important fact that human

beings are persons in whom a whole hierarchy of values and ends can be related to, and superimposed upon, the natural basis of their life, and that they must try to preserve a creative unity between the various levels of their existence, is obscured or denied in Kinsey's consistent naturalism, and its logical fruit, a crude hedonism, in terms of which the achievement of orgasm becomes the *summum bonum* of his value scheme. His attitude toward the family as an institution of civilisation is determined by the same blindness toward the person; for persons have the ability not only to create a whole hierarchy of values and ends but to subordinate immediate satisfactions to large term social ends and purposes.

Kinsey is tolerant toward every type of sexual promiscuity, even though the evidence is conclusive that extra-marital relations may lead to divorce. His only recognition of this problem is contained in his record of the opinion of a percentage of women in his samples who admitted extra-marital activity, but had persuaded themselves that it was not directly related to the break-up of their marriage. His inability to measure any dimension of the "dignity of man" is of course paralleled by his inability to understand the unique "misery" of man, derived from the same source from which his creativity is derived, namely from his unique freedom. This freedom makes it possible for men to make some impulse or vitality the perverse centre of their existence as animals cannot, and do not do.

Thus Kinsey is always concerned to prove that the sexual capacities of people are underrated, and that the physical harm from frequent sexual indulgence is overrated. He is convinced that men's and women's desire and need for sexual "outlets" is much greater than usually supposed. But he is not concerned with the fact that some of these cases may be pathetic men or women who are so obsessed with the sexual function and satisfaction that they have become incapable of any creative relationships. He knows nothing of characteristically human forms of inordinancy above the level of animal life with which the moral codes of mankind have had to deal.

The primary defect of this failure to recognise the person appears in his blindness to the central problem of man's sexual life, given by the fact that sexual relations are necessarily relations between persons and that they also involve

a degree of physical intimacy of the two partners, giving themselves to each other, which becomes intolerable if undertaken without mutual respect and ultimately without mutual fidelity. Nor does he know that women have a particular stake in this issue, for the male is usually the aggressor in sexual intimacy, and the woman "gives herself." The unscrupulous male may use every wile and stratagem to secure sexual satisfaction from the female without offering her the love and respect which would make the experience tolerable to her as a person.

The literature of all nations is filled with themes emerging from this conflict between "love and lust," as one psychiatrist has defined the two forces which mutually support, but may also contradict each other. The "double standard," to which one must raise objections from an ultimate standpoint, has been preserved, not so much because of male dominance, but because the woman, as mother, is closer to the heart of the family, more necessary to the children; her loyalty is therefore more necessary to the integrity of the family than that of the male. Kinsey might profitably read Timasheff's "Great Retreat" in which the history of sex relations under Communism is recorded. All efforts to protect the integrity of the family were relaxed, prompted by the Marxist notion that nothing but the male's "property" interests were involved. Gradually it became apparent that the woman, with her more intimate relation to the child, had more at stake in a stable family than the man.

Kinsey approaches the problem of the person obliquely when he speaks of the necessity of "emotional adjustments" to which sexual experience may contribute. In listing the various reasons for tolerance toward pre-marital coitus, he expresses the conviction "that it may develop the capacity for particular emotional adjustments which are needed in the marriage relation" (p. 308). In giving his reasons for changing moral standards to correspond to changed circumstances he enumerates the possession of means of contraception, the control of venereal disease and the "scientific understanding of the emotions which underline human relations" (p. 309). The measure of his scientific understanding of the complexity of these emotions is attested by his consistent opinion that relations involving only sexual satisfaction are adequate preparations for relations in which the whole personality is involved. He never hints that

the one type of relation might actually be a detriment for understanding the deeper and more complex relation.

As a consequence of viewing the field of sexual relations only in the dimension of physiology, Kinsey is naturally unable to see any virtue in any of the standards by which the peoples of the world have sought to discipline the powerful sexual impulse. He obscures the universality of the prohibition of adultery, equalling the prohibition of murder and theft, by calling attention to peripheral relativities in sexual codes. These are indeed great, as for instance in attitudes toward questions of nudity and dress. Furthermore, he interprets the expression of feelings of guilt as always due to the social pressure upon the individual. Several times he observes that the sexual relation would be more pleasurable if the feeling of guilt could be removed. It could ostensibly be removed, if capricious codes did not press upon the individual conscience.

Obviously the expression of the moral sense is partly socially conditioned. But on the essentials it not only approaches universality, but arises within the individual as the expression of his essential being against acts which he feels to be violations of his essence. If a person feels that he has either violated his own self-respect by demanding himself, or has violated another person by making her merely an instrument for the satisfaction of a momentary desire, that might be an expression of an uneasy conscience above all the relativities of a moral code. Nor would the breaking of faith in an intimate relation necessarily be condoned by the injured partner, as Kinsey consistently implies, if only statistical evidence were marshalled to prove that this lack of fidelity is more general than the partner supposed. Kinsey's understanding of the operations of "conscience" is expressed in the fact that he thinks it significant that most of those who regretted pre-marital or extra-marital promiscuity were those who had least experience. He adds confidently that "initial regrets are frequently resolved as the individual matures and acquires more experience" (p. 317). He is obviously ignorant of the capacity of the person for self-deception and of the growth of that capacity with maturity and experience. The infinite complexities of the human spirit are in fact unknown to Kinsey, if they are above the level of refinements in erotic pleasure.

It is natural that a position such as Kinsey's, which is impatient with any kind of restraint upon sexual activity, should

be critical of religion as a source of such restraint. As a matter of fact a good case could be made against Christianity for the negative attitude toward sex which is acquired from the Greek part of its heritage. According to Greek body-mind dualism, physical desires are the root of evil; and the sexual desire is held to be particularly typical of the "lusts of the body" because of their great vigour and the difficulty of controlling them.

But the absurd hedonism which informs Kinsey's thought is not a good vantage point from which to make that case. He is, in any event, too indiscriminate to detect the difference in the moral attitudes of the three great religious groups. Protestants do not believe, as a whole, in detailed and inflexible moral propositions of the "natural law," as Catholics do. And the Jewish faith, with its conception of the integral unity of the person in body and soul, is free of the negative attitude toward the body which infects some Christian thought.

These differences make the evidence which Kinsey presents on the effect of religion on sexual behaviour all the more impressive. He distinguishes in every case between three categories in each religious group, the "devout," the "moderate," and the "inactive." The significant point is that the statistics prove more than there is between the three categories in each group. The devout are in every case least given to promiscuity and masturbation. In the case of the prohibition of masturbation one may suspect too much rigour of conscience in many cases. But on the whole the evidence points to the fact that religion has an effect upon conduct, particularly sex conduct, beyond and above specific requirements of moral law. The religious heightening of the sense of personal responsibility for covenants in which one is engaged, of mutual respect and fidelity between persons, and the religious accentuation of personal self-respect, must certainly be operative in the lives which yield these impressive statistics.

It is a fact of history that some moral attitudes are much more universal than detailed prescriptions of conduct, the relativity of which Kinsey rightly discerns. One of the most universal of these attitudes is the sense of loyalty to covenants. The marriage covenant is one of the most significant covenants in human civilisation. Perhaps another reason why religion operates so powerfully upon sex standards is that a religious sense of respect and loyalty between persons is the more

effective, the simpler the covenant and the relationship. In more complex human relations, attitudes depend much more upon a sophisticated understanding of the complexities.

The uncritical character of Kinsey's moral anarchism, and the vulgar quality of his hedonism, have prevented him from raising some significant issues in the field of sexual behaviour, and from effectively challenging religious and other forms of prurience. The significant point is that the statistics prove that there is less difference between the three religious groups than there is between the three categories in each group. There is consequently a greater measure of tolerance for "offences" which are not too flagrant. This tolerance has been achieved because it is widely recognised that the vagrancy of the sexual passion is very great, and that therefore peripheral misconduct, and occasional, rather than perpetual or habitual defiances of the basic loyalties must be dealt with without too much severity on the part of the offended party.

In the case of such problems as masturbation, particularly among boys, modern parents will generally be concerned to prevent an undue sense of guilt, rather than to accentuate that sense. Mr. Kinsey will be surprised to know (though any psychiatrist could have told him) that the boy or girl may have the sense of guilt even when the parent has been anxious to mitigate rather than accentuate it. A wise approach to sex problems must also consider some typically modern accentuations of ancient and perennial tensions. One of the most important of these is the long period which intervenes between puberty and the age when marriage becomes a financial possibility, particularly in those classes in which a long educational preparation for professional careers is necessary. The higher incidence of pre-marital coitus in the college group, according to Kinsey's data, may be explained by this factor, rather than by their supposedly higher degree of sophistication.

But the young people of this generation, since the war, are on the way to solving this problem creatively. Kinsey's data do not reveal this trend very much, but it is very apparent. They begin their marriage partnership while still in college. Every evidence points to the success of these early marriages, and to the advantages which both partners gain from the woman's assumption of the responsibilities of child-bearing at an early age. There is also a good deal of evidence that the chance of mutual pleasure in the sexual relation has greatly

increased among these young couples, and that both the problem of the frigidity of the woman and the possibility of mutual orgasm are on the way of solution by healthy young people without the practice of pre-marital promiscuity which Kinsey regards as indispensable for their solution. That there is a great deal of experimentation short of coitus before marriage is evident to any counsellor of young people. This conduct is one of the peripheral areas in the sexual field in which the rigorists must learn more tolerance. Unfortunately their attitudes will be hardened rather than softened by Kinsey's proposals of anarchism in the field of sex.

One must raise the question whether Kinsey's approach to complex ethical problems in the sexual field is not an indication of one of the deplorable effects of the introduction of the so-called "methods of science" into the field of the humanities. There is nothing wrong with the methods of science as such. Kinsey himself is an honest scientist in collating his data. But unfortunately the modern attempt to subject the behaviour of people to scientific scrutiny frequently suffers from the imposition of viewpoints which are legitimate in the natural sciences to the world of human history, where they may be less valuable, because the human world differs from nature by the radical freedom of the human person.

This freedom makes for the uniqueness of the individual. It also creates a field of complex causation, about which it is hazardous to draw any casual sequences, because every fact is so complexly related to previous events that a purely scientific judgment is impossible. It is impossible in the sense that events do not follow each other "in a necessary manner" in such a way that a scientific judgment would be valid. A judgment about the relation of promiscuity to divorce, for instance, can be scientific only in the sense that honest statistics on the relation of promiscuity to divorce in some previous and limited period of history are presented. But a final judgment will depend, not so much upon the statistical evidence, as upon the guiding presuppositions and value judgements which govern the inquiry.

About the problem of the relation of a frame of reference of a scientific inquiry to the actual data of the inquiry, Kinsey is quite ignorant, because that is a problem which does not occur in the natural sciences; or it is much more subordinate than in the humanities. One has the suspicion that the crude

physiological naturalism which governs Kinsey's inquiry is not so much a considered frame of reference as it is a scheme of thought into which he was betrayed by ignorance. He surveyed a given field of inquiry and found that sexual life was everywhere under disciplines and restraints which could not be understood from the standpoint of sexual life itself. He obscured or was ignorant of the dimensions of human history, from the understanding of which these restraints could be given some meaning. Even if one would be compelled to criticise their extreme rigour, one might suspect that in the field of sex, particularly, the morbid rigour of the law enforcer has a secret affinity with some of the same forces which actuated the law violator. But Kinsey makes no room for responsible criticisms of extant moral codes and attitudes, due to the consistency of his hedonism, and his blindness to all the complexities of the relation of the sexual impulse to the institutions of civilisation.

This criticism does not imply that Kinsey's defects are the inevitable consequence of a "scientific" attitude toward sexual problems. His defects merely represent the fruit of one extreme form of naturalism which may think itself justified by modern science. The psychiatrists, who are certainly as "scientific" as Kinsey, but who have a more adequate view of the human person, are therefore generally critical of his approach. An eminent psychiatrist has suggested that on this issue the psychiatrists would find themselves in alliance with the religious leaders, no matter how widely these two groups may differ in their attitude toward the sexual problem.

Problem children or problem adults?

EDUCATION ABOUT SEX Changing Motives and Methods

Benjamin C. Gruenberg, Ph.D.

BENJAMIN C. GRUENBERG is one of our foremost pioneers in the field of sex education. He first became interested in this subject when, as a young biology teacher in the New York City high schools, he found himself teaching about sex and reproduction contrary to the school curriculum, which upheld the traditional taboos.

Dr. Gruenberg is well known as an author, editor and lecturer. Among his many books are *High Schools and Sex Education*, *Parents and Sex Education*, *Biology and Human Life*, *The Story of Evolution*, and *Science and the Public Mind*. He has lectured at the New School for Social Research, the College of the City of New York, the University of Colorado and the Pennsylvania School of Social Work, and has been a consultant for the U.S. Public Health Service and the Office of Education, numerous other government agencies and educational associations, and Director of the American Association for Medical Progress. He has also done research in such subjects as comparative psychology, plant physiology, medical economics, vocational guidance, and adult education. Dr. Gruenberg and his wife, the child expert Sidonie Gruenberg, recently celebrated their fiftieth wedding anniversary. They have four children and ten grandchildren.

Changing Motives and Methods

Benjamin C. Gruenberg

Because sex is so close to people's emotions, and yet so far from candid speech, the second Kinsey Report will inevitably stir up resentment and hostility, as well as controversy.

We will be told that the findings cannot be true because they run counter to what we know of the life of the males and females of this country—things just cannot be so bad.

We will be told that such deviations from the established norms of sexual behaviour as the high frequency of pre-marital sex experience, adultery, homosexuality and masturbation found among the 5,940 women studied would prevail chiefly among the uneducated and the underprivileged. Certainly many of those who read serious books would consider these patterns as close to delinquent or even criminal, since in most parts of the country they violate existing statutes—based, presumably, on religious or moral principles.

We will be told that the picture which the report paints is revolting to all right-minded people (like ourselves), and so sets up false standards and ideals for the rising generation. And many will feel sure that the women in the Kinsey sample must have had something wrong in their education and religious training when they were young.

Must we interpret this report as showing that among people of means and educational opportunity, "sexual morality" has actually declined in recent decades? We might, alternatively, take the given facts to show that the masses, as they rose rapidly into the higher levels of material prosperity, of occupational competence, and of all outward similitudes to those who were, in an earlier generation, the models of decorum and rectitude, brought with them *their* ways of life (p. 324, footnote 34).

The generalisations from the Kinsey findings (even with their acknowledged limitations) show us a great diversity of patterns, representing individual variations in drives and sensitivity and responsiveness. They show us great variations in

esthetic and emotional make-up. They show also variations due to educational, religious and cultural influences.

Why the Studies Were Started

The senior author of this Report was led to initiate these studies because, as a teacher of zoology, he was unable to answer some of the questions of his students about sex and human reproduction. He had to clarify his own thinking, and he hopes that the reports on the sexual behaviour of men and women will furnish important data for programmes of "sex education."

As everybody knows, parents had long ago realised the importance of the early education of children on matters of sex. But while there has been much theory as to what things children should be taught, and how the teaching should be conducted, we had "but few data on which to base any programme of sex education." Accordingly, the investigators "obtained information from our subjects in regard to the ages at which they acquired their first knowledge of various aspects of sex, the sources of their first knowledge, and the ages at which they first became involved in each type of sexual activity. In addition . . . we have engaged in a more detailed study of younger children . . . The study needs to be carried further before we are ready to report in detail, but some things already seem clear" (p. 15).

In fact, parents and others in increasing numbers had come to realise the importance of education regarding sex much more than thirty years ago, as the authors estimate. The problem was discussed at least eight years ago. The conditions which gave adults concern still trouble parents, so that we seem to have made very little progress over the years. But if we consider why parents were concerned, or their motives for urging some kind of sex education for children, we can see both the reason for the lag, and at least some of the reasons for the ineffectiveness of various programmes.

Why Sex Education Was Considered Important

It is significant that the earlier efforts to furnish any kind of sex education were chiefly motivated by fears—fears about

illicit sex experience, fear of prostitution and some of its economic and civic concomitants, fear of the venereal diseases, and fear of unwanted pregnancies in unmarried girls. The goal was to discourage interest in sex or to make traditional taboos effective, and the early programmes were all so tied up with the doctrine of sin that it was in the first instance religionists and moralists who took the initiative.

The National League for the Protection of the Family was formed in 1890. The American Purity Alliance was formed in 1895. In the nineties of the last century, and well up to the beginning of the first World War, itinerant lecturers found many of the private boarding schools for boys and some of the smaller colleges ready to let them "enlighten" the boys on the horrors of the venereal diseases. Aside from any factual information they might convey, these lectures were typically very dramatic and impressive—so much so that the lecturers were said to compare notes on the number of fellows who passed out during the talks at one institution or another.

When the causative parasites for gonorrhea and syphilis were discovered early in this century, the medical profession did not immediately take the initiative in educating young people, to say nothing of the older ones. The prevailing attitudes against the open consideration of sex, and anything pertaining to sex, seemed to be insuperable obstacles. But after two international conferences held in Brussels (1902 and 1904), Dr. Prince A. Morrow formed the Society for Social and Moral Prophylaxis in 1905, and undertook to break through the protective wall of silence. Similar organisations were formed in eleven states, and these later combined into the "American Federation for Social Hygiene," an ingenious euphemism that made possible considerable propaganda and publicity without encountering serious opposition. But Dr. Richard C. Cabot raised some questions about information regarding sex. He pointed to the actual behaviour of the young gentlemen of the medical schools, who were probably as well informed on the anatomy and physiology of human reproduction and on communicable diseases as we could ever expect the population at large to be.

There were many separate movements. There were many plans. There were books and pamphlets directed to parents, to teachers, and to young readers. "Physiology and Hygiene,"

as a new school subject intended to promote health, was really motivated by the propaganda to impress children with the evil effects of alcohol and tobacco. But early in the century the teachers of this subject, as well as the "physical education" teachers (who were, by the time the second World War started, chiefly gymnasium directors and athletic coaches) were called upon to guide and enlighten their charges with reference to sex.

Objections to Sex Education

The sporadic efforts of health teachers and biology teachers and gymnasium directors were not generally effective. When the proposal was made to bring "sex education" into the schools, many educators and administrators had already acknowledged the need, but most of them were shocked at the idea of taking the problem into schoolrooms. Various church groups were alarmed, protesting that a "subject" so close to religious concern should never be entrusted to lay teachers. So the top educators said: "Leave it to the home." And religious leaders said: "Leave it to us."

Parents on the whole, however, were disturbed for a different reason. All plans and proposals they sensed to be reproaches; many parents frankly acknowledged that they had failed their children, and many also realised that the churches, too, had failed them as well as their children. They would have been glad to hand the task over to the schools. But nearly everybody, including classroom teachers themselves, recognised that teachers were not equipped to be of great help either in enlightening the children or guiding them. The young teachers, for the most part, were ignorant of what sex education might require, and inexperienced in the arts of living. The older teachers, quite generally, were frustrated spinsters, for until after the first World War, most school jurisdictions would not employ married women as teachers.

The basic difficulty, however, came from the naïve assumption that for "educational" purposes "sex" could be treated as a subject of discourse, like grammar or geography. The underlying obstacle to educating even the teachers came from the difficulty of separating the "subject" from the involvements of the individual's affections and emotions, which were

indeed the areas that needed "educating." The traditional taboos confused both the intellectual and the moral consideration of sex behaviour.

Thus it was because of the confusion of aims that "sex education" frequently failed, even when parents and teachers made conscientious efforts to do their best. Normally, we try to encourage children's interest in the many aspects of the world around them. We make them feel that their curiosities and explorations and adventuring and experimenting are proper and praiseworthy. But if we draw the line at questions about sex, or about the origin of the earth or the reason for sickness, we force them either to abandon the search for answers to their questions or to adopt a policy of secrecy. And some questions—some forbidden questions—cannot be abandoned, so that the child is forced into secrecy and dissimulation.

It may be argued seriously that the repression of children's curiosities is a possible factor in the development of anti-intellectual attitudes and also a factor in widespread suspicion or mistrust among individuals and groups. At any rate, there is no doubt that the identification of sex with sin has obstructed rational considerations.

It is fair to say that before the first World War most boys and girls had no direct communication with informed, sympathetic and considerate adults regarding sex, reproduction and marriage. For many decades, in by far the largest portions of the populations, boys and girls could try to clear up their own confusions only by exchanging with their close companions legends, misinformation, superstitions and wild inferences. When they got into trouble they were most likely to be given reproaches and admonitions and preachments loaded with fear and sin, but little information as to the place of sex in life and little guidance on what to do. And it must be emphasised that most parents didn't know, most teachers didn't know, and most preachers didn't know.

Today children and young people exchange with one another such intelligence as they receive, embellished with whatever misunderstandings go with it. They compare notes. They argue. But no half a dozen boys and girls, conscientiously enlightened by their respective parents, can meet and extract from their combined wisdom a unified and reasonable view of life. "Undesirable companions" are likely to be more real-

istic as to the facts of life, but they are not likely to respect the inhibitions and taboos which the more protected children derive from their parents.

Obstacles to Sex Education

The many programmes for sex education evolved or proposed in this country have encountered a variety of obstacles:

(1) The heterogeneity of our population, because of the rapid increase through varied immigration brought about an intermingling of diverse ethnic and religious and nationality groups on a large scale, in spite of the tendency for newcomers to become segregated.

(2) The rapid acceleration of urbanisation after the Civil War added to the confusion, since city dwellers with a rural background had a slant on sex that was just as "foreign" to their new neighbours as that of people with different religious or ethnic backgrounds.

(3) The rapid extension of schooling to more and more children, and the rapid increase in the average amount of schooling for each child, diffused to millions of families, along with the school arts, a vast mass of information about many diverse modes of living, different periods and cultures. Large numbers of people became envious of a kind of life being advertised through all sorts of media—fiction, theatre, movies, newspapers, magazines, show windows. The schools also played an essential role in raising the technological skills of the population, and that meant greater individual prosperity as well as generally higher productivity.

(4) The progressive increase of internal migration followed industrialisation and resulted in wider redistribution of families to new regions, creating the need for adjustment to new surroundings, new kinds of neighbours, new local usages.

Our Spiritual Heterogeneity

Nothing reflects so strikingly the spiritual heterogeneity in the cultural backgrounds of our population as the contradictory attitudes toward prostitution and virginity. First is the

widely prevalent acceptance, even today, of the subordinate status of women, in spite of their political enfranchisement, and even though doors are open for them to practically all schools and professions and trades and offices. The inferior status persists in commercial prostitution; for the customers of the business, whoever they may be, the women involved are always other people's daughters. In fact, prostitution has been defended as necessary to protect "our" girls and women. The traffic of the so-called "white slave" business has to do with the unassimilated portions of our population, exactly as slaves were considered *other* people by the owning classes.

The "double standard" with regard to pre-marital sexual activities reflects a similar subordination of the female to the male, as property. In the Kinsey Report this is described as "a compromise between the absolutist approach to the morality of pre-marital coitus and a practical consideration of the realities of human nature" (p. 322). And the historical basis for this compromise lies in the practical impossibility of preventing the majority of males from having coitus before marriage, "while females . . . have proved to be more controllable," in part, at least, because of organic or psychic differences between the sexes.

If a "single standard" is desirable, the question still remains whether it is to be the presumably "more moral" traditional standard of the female, or the "lower" standard of the male.

Absolute and Relative Morality

Conformity in sex behaviour is as necessary for the stability of any society as conformity in relation to property or in the daily intercourse of individuals or groups. In a given society, there is rarely any doubt as to what is considered right and what is considered wrong. And for all practical purposes, the "right" is absolute, as it has been in our traditions.

The incongruities among the beliefs or principles and practices existing in a highly mixed population such as ours are to many clear evidence that an absolute morality is essential for maintaining a stable society. The doctrine of sex as sin is such an absolute. This doctrine raised avoidances to the level of virtues. One could practice self-denial or abstention "for its own sake." The cults of asceticism, abstinence, mortification

and self-denial as religious forms are oriented entirely toward finding favour among the gods, and toward storing up treasures in heaven—as in banking, the aim is to save all possible pleasures now, to make sure of an ample reserve to draw upon later. The popularity of good and evil, when both are absolutes, will make the individual who rejects the code, or its sanctions, seek good at the opposite pole. Sex becomes a major good for its own sake, so that, for example, the typical playboy will make his chief game a career of sex.

The same diversities indicate just as logically that no code, with its sanctions, is equally suitable for all the people in Babylon. We recognise this when we say, "One man's meat is another man's poison." Yet no code would be more enforceable than existing codes are—except through compulsion by an overriding power or authority. But the idea of "relativity" in morals was creeping into people's minds even faster than the spread of literacy, and far ahead of the speculations of anthropologists. In a monogamous culture almost anybody could see, for example, that a plurality of wives was permissible for those who could afford it. In a society soaked in the horror of sin, absolution was more readily available to some than to others. And generally, those who knew their way about got more than did the excessively stupid and pious. The privileges of the superior included privileges regarding sex. What the spread of democratic notions did do, in Europe as in this country, was to make more and more people assume that it was right to aspire to a life more like that enjoyed by those who had all the privileges. As John Ruskin suggested, the ultimate goal of democracy is to assure to "everybody a large estate with plenty of servants." Yet it is nonsense to assume that "relativity" means no morals at all.

Science Versus Morals

In the course of their studies, Kinsey and his associates have avoided moral judgments so far as possible. That is a necessary condition for obtaining the facts which they seek. But in generalising and summarising their findings, and in comparing types of behaviour which they record, they inevitably suggest social or legal or moral meanings that imply value judgments. The essential findings of the Kinsey Reports may

well be of social significance, even if the facts come from a small and rather selected sample. Although such facts by themselves cannot furnish guides for legislation or a basis for a moral code, the findings do raise questions as to what we should want in our "education about sex." This is partly because the findings deal with conditions that are not generally recognised and partly because they reveal tremendous diversity in attitudes and practices, with corresponding contradictions and confusions: we have no *common sense* regarding sex.

The facts show that among the women represented by the sample studied a large proportion had failed to follow certain traditional patterns of sexual behaviour. Whether we approve of the traditional code or not, the facts of both Kinsey Reports no more indicate what is normal or desirable or "right" than any recorded system of religion or philosophy or law. The facts merely show that actual practices do not agree with the laws or with the rules of the various religions. From emphasis upon certain forms of behaviour as "realities of human nature," many readers are likely to sense a danger that the reports will be used to rationalise almost anything from a revision of marriage and divorce laws (which is certainly very much needed), or successive trial-and-error marriages, to whatever anyone may mean by "free love."

Kinsey rejects as basically unsound the dualism which separates mind and matter as two independent entities. He recognises that even as a zoologist he could not adequately describe human sexual behaviour exclusively in terms of physical or chemical "facts." Accordingly, he uses part of chapter sixteen to explain "learning and conditioning" as processes that modify sexual behaviour, not only in man but also in other primates, in other orders of mammals and in various birds. The modifications, which result from prior experiences, include the substitution of more or less irrelevant symbols or objects for the "natural" sexual stimuli and the substitution of more or less unrelated activities for "natural" responses to sexual arousal. They include changes in vigour or intensity or frequency of the "behaviour" in response to various stimuli. And they include the substitution of "satisfactions" by acquired or "learned" modes of behaviour—as we can be amused or aroused by a mere symbol or gesture.

The report analyses the sexual behaviour of the females

studied according to the amount of education, religious background, parental occupations, and economic status. These are definitely social classifications, and are significant presumably because these factors may possibly modify instinctual sexual behaviour to some extent. Finally, the report compares the relative "conditionability" of the two sexes to various sexual stimuli.

Kinsey considers males to be more "conditionable" than females because males more frequently exhibit "fetishism," or the association of sex with material objects such as clothing, furniture, buildings, pictures, places, and other fragments of experience. On the other hand, the report considers females to be more "moral" than males because they are not so frequently carried away by the sex drive.

We might note, without transcending the limits of scientific zoology, that while conditionability is not peculiar to human beings, it is more far-reaching with us because of our self-awareness and our distinctive mental capacities, our sociability (with a high capacity for identification and compassion), and because of the great extent to which the emotions are involved in all organic functions. It is this adaptability and teachability that make possible the modification of the raw impulses of the infant to the inhibitions and compulsions of any particular society. The data on the way the women studied really behave sexually do indicate the kinds of adjustments that certain groups of women have made to the conditions under which they lived. We learn how adaptable the human organism is to a great variety of circumstances.

Sex and Character

It is generally agreed that sex education is an aspect of character education. There is less agreement, however, as to the kind of character we want, and as to the nature of education.

Under a system of morality that pre-supposes each child to be conceived in sin, we must force sex, and thoughts about sex, into the regions of shame and terror. We have seen some of the consequences of the corollary doctrine that sex may be sanctified only when used for procreation. Many men and women, no doubt, developed noble characters through

consistent compliance with such doctrines. But there are indications in history that such sex education produced a great deal of hypocrisy and suspicion and cruelty.

Accepting sex as intrinsic in human nature makes it as legitimate and as "right" as speech and curiosity and compassion and love for others. It is as proper as the capacity to manipulate materials and ideas to create new forms of utility and beauty and truth. But the question is not one of "either-or," but of "how and how much," of "when" and "where" and "what for." It is not enough to repeat the Greek "moderation in all things," which may do for eating and drinking, playing and working; it will not do because *sex primarily involves others*. Quite apart from sex as a factor in reproduction, implying children, with their peculiar demands in the family and in society at large, sex normally acts in a *relationship* between two persons, for it is inseparable from the dimorphic nature of man.

It is true that we can isolate a sexual arousal-response-orgasm sequence and deal with it by itself. It is certainly sexual, or at least it is a sequence found only in males as male and females as female. And it need not involve any other person. But the moment others are involved, the moral question is—what is the individual's attitude toward other people, and specifically, toward another person.

The simplest form of the question is this: Is it compatible with your attitude, or moral sense, or feeling about right and wrong, to use another person as an instrument for your private or personal purposes? Whether the satisfaction sought is sexual or mercenary or scientific, the question is whether we do in fact respect the other human being, or use him rather as a thing, disregarding his dignity and his rights as a person.

Closely related to this question of attitude, and perhaps prior to it, is that of one's attitude toward one's own self as a person. What kind of a person do you think you are? What kind of a person do you mean to be? What do you want others to think of you? The form of the basic question, and the answers, change from childhood on. How far it changes, what forms it eventually takes, and the answers, are of course matters of the individual's unique constitution or inheritance. But time and place and circumstance also play their roles—because the unique person is "conditionable." And the question involves one's attitude toward one's own sex and toward the

opposite sex; and especially one's attitude toward his or her own sexuality.

We all have probably been subjected to the efforts of various men and women to "educate" us to our responsibilities. Yet with respect to sex, a substantial proportion of men and women never seem to have discovered that they had any responsibilities. This is indicated in part by the frequency of the so-called sex delinquencies; by the large number of divorces from which one or both partners proceed casually to an indefinite series of re-marriages and re-dissolutions; by the unwanted children abandoned more or less informally by their mothers, who had in many cases been abandoned by the fathers.

Responsibility in sex will probably mean a considerable amount of frank exploration of potential congenialities. Young people must be able to make an appraisal of "attractive" companions for the honest purpose of finding a mate. Pre-marital sex experience, although shocking to many, has been taken for granted even in Christian lands, and sometimes it has been justified explicitly as a necessary means of discovering compatibilities, or their absence. And more specifically, in many parts of this country as well as in European countries, pre-marital relations have been accepted to the point of deferring marriage commitments until the girl is pregnant, in order to be sure that the couple will be able to beget children, which is the purpose of marriage.

We can judge to what extent these attitudes are subject to educational influences only from what we find out about how people actually behave—and from such facts as we can find in the two volumes of the Kinsey Report. *People differ*. Some take their own personality seriously, but not the personality of others. Some take their love life seriously—not necessarily solemnly. But some remain at play—that is—irresponsible, throughout life. Some feel an obligation to continue growing as long as they live—along with their love and their sex and their art, or whatever holds them; while others are satisfied to live day by day, unencumbered by any obligations to others, or to their own future.

Sex-play

In infancy and childhood, we expect a considerable amount of experimental play—play with the genitals and other

children, as well as with the fingers and sticks and stones and dogs and dolls. The "sexuality" of the child is unquestionably sexual, but it is also different from that of an adult. Some time during adolescence—much earlier for some, and much later in others—boys and girls become interested in particular individuals of the opposite sex, sometimes in several others at the same time, or in alternation. This is sexual too, and normally leads to more exclusive mutual affection of variable intensity and duration. This falling in love and out again is also part of the sex complex, without involving coitus, or even petting or daydreaming to orgasm. Whatever inhibitions or restraints act in individual cases, the pattern carries the moral implication of whatever one's attitude is toward others as persons. *

Although as a biologist Kinsey rejects the doctrine of sin, he seems to imply that since we began in childhood to seek sexual satisfactions we must expect a morality that is essentially infantile. For example, various forms of pre-adolescent sex-play in girls, including complete sexual union with older boys or men, are reported as "providing emotional satisfaction which had conditioned the females for the acceptance of later sexual activities" (p. 115). On the other hand, "guilt reactions" had made the childhood experiences "traumatic," especially where the children had been discovered by adults who reprimanded them or applied physical punishment; and "these guilt reactions had in many instances prevented the female from accepting sex relations in her adult married relationships." That is, human beings may have their attitudes "conditioned" away from sex as well as toward it. In the absence of guilt reactions, "there is little evidence that [such pre-adolescent sex experience] had done any damage to later sexual adjustment." There is also reference to the Katherine B. Davis report (from a study of 2,200 women) that there is no significant correlation between pre-adolescent sex-play and happiness in marriage.

Males carry sex-play, and sex-play attitudes, continuously into adulthood. Females seem to have an interval in which sex-play is latent or inactive; and that is followed by a more mature form of sexual experimenting. To be sure, in a preponderance of cases parents protect adolescent girls against evil thoughts and suggestions, against strangers, against unsupervised mixed gatherings, to a vastly greater extent than

they protect the males. And while our law has nearly abandoned the traditional assumption of the husband's property rights in his fiancée or wife, our moral judgments still condemn pre-marital sex activity for the female.

We may accept children's sex-play and pre-adolescent explorations and experimentation as normal manifestations of human nature. There is good reason to believe that this kind of behaviour, which often goes as far as complete coitus or orgasm, is taken too solemnly by parents and teachers; and that the uncompromising and unsympathetic attitude of elders results in fear of sex, and in hostility toward parents, with more or less generalised rebelliousness against the killjoy repressiveness of the adult world.

The discovery of sexuality in infants and sex-play in children, combined with repeated emphasis upon sexual satisfaction as a "reality of human nature" seems to imply that happiness comes from doing always what one feels like doing or taking always what one wants. But we have discovered also conditionability. From the first we dilute the child's happiness with various inhibitions and restraints. We condition him, for example, against playing with fire and strange cats. Every increase of knowledge brings an increase of sorrow. Yet the human infant continues to learn, for the alternative may be greater sorrow. This is the principle of "conditioning" Kinsey seems to count on to explain differences as to sex behaviour among males and females.

Can Children Mature?

Protection and segregation may not be the best means of conditioning either boys or girls to go the way we think they should. But to the extent that girls and boys do receive different treatment, we must expect some differences to develop in their attitudes. It seems rather simple to consider the observed differences in sexual behaviour between males and females to represent ultimate "realities in human nature," without regard for traditions and circumstances. It is not clear whether these "realities" are to guide our legislators and educators in formulating standards of behaviour, or to warn them of the futility of trying to reach beyond human nature. But since "conditioning" is also a reality of human nature, it

seems reasonable to ask: "How far can we alter an infant's instinctual patterns?"

This is an old question, and it raises in turn a multitude of others, moot and controversial, for which we have no dependable answers. But the very diversity of behaviour patterns among males as well as among females already lends some justification to the moralists for reproaching the parents or the movies or the schools for the deplorable conditions that warrant our elaborate investigations. The moralists ask: "If some children were guided to become exemplary adults, why weren't yours?"

Yet reproaches to parents seem always to assume some absolute or ideal pattern to which all should conform; and they assume, moreover, standard procedures of discipline or teaching as infallible means for insuring the desired goals. But whatever may be desirable, it is evident that parents are not to be blamed for trying to carry on their own ways, learned from the past, against the efforts of neighbouring parents to carry on divergent or even contradictory ways. It isn't always easy to reconcile what different parents bring with them from their respective ancestries.

Perhaps there are sex differences that are relevant—something other, perhaps, than simply saying that "females are more moral," or males are more "aggressive." The important questions would seem to be (aside from any suggestion of an ideal pattern for all)—"Are there any important differences between the sexes as to capacity to mature?" For example, is it universally true that "girls will some day be women, but boys will always be boys?" Are the differences related to the emotional or sentimental concomitants of motherhood—or is that experience relevant? Do we find, as fact, that some males at least become approximately as mature as the more mature women? Or do we find, as fact, married women—mothers, even—who remain girlish in their values and attitudes and irresponsibilities?

These questions recall some older ones regarding "equality," but whatever differences we may find, as fact, we shall have to accept without prejudice. We need not attempt to demonstrate the "equality of the sexes" any more than the "equality of all men." We have merely to accept as fact that the two sexes are equally significant in developing the distinctive qualities of the race. Males and females have equal claims

to being treated as persons—not as things to be manipulated by others. Subjectively, males and females have the same “right” to accept themselves as what they are. Dimorphism is inseparable from the nature of the species. Males and females have to assume sex impulses without any sense of guilt, with no apologies, without self-reproach; and they also have to assume that sexual satisfaction is a normal part of life and personality.

If equal access to the heritage and potentialities of our common nature is the first principle of a “democratic” or free society, the dealings of any two persons, in relation to sex as in all other relations, must be with mutual regard for individual needs or interests. This would seem to be a minimum implication of the requirement of universal respect for the dignity of each person, regardless of differences in race, creed, nationality, special talents or disabilities, social status—or sex.

What is Natural?

It is in the nature of the child to reach out for whatever catches his eye, to push over whatever stands in his way—or whoever, if he can manage. It is in the nature of juvenile man to use his power for his own ends and to disregard the “equal” desire of others to have their way, so far as they are able. Our moralities, however, emerge from the fact that human beings are extremely social and remarkably adaptable to one another; the complexity of a human group that continues indefinitely with a reasonable degree of harmony and good will is a measure of what is possible for human nature.

Traditional ways of living include traditional ways of converting a helpless and ignorant and “selfish” infant into a more or less decent member of the family and the community. The total effort of the parents and other adults to adjust the individual to an acceptable conformity to the demands of the community is the primary education. Of course, this involves more than shouting “don’t!” at appropriate points. We all know by now that children are influenced by hundreds of happenings and experiences that their elders do not even know about, and that parents and teachers often produce effects quite different from those they intend. At any rate, education is required for getting along with the opposite sex as well as

for getting along with merchants and customers, with officers and with privates. All human relationships involve acquired moral sentiments as well as a code of the required and the forbidden.

An infant is not responsible; but human beings have the capacity to become responsible in dealing with others or in carrying out tasks without being watched. Too many children grow into adulthood—into sexual maturity—without knowing just what to do with their impulses, or with other people whom they can use, or who stand in their way. If it is natural for a child to be impulsive, uncontrolled, inconsiderate, it is also natural for him to modify his reactions to fit in with what goes on around him. We cannot build up a theory of the good life or a programme of education by insisting upon a pure and undefiled “human nature” for some of our principles, and upon “conditionability” for others more to our taste.

Science and Morals

In the Kinsey reports there is the direct or implied identification of any processes culminating in orgasm as “sexual satisfaction.” The study ignores entirely the vast complex of emotions and sentiments and fantasy that sex involves, presumably because these are too elusive for identifying and counting. But we cannot overlook the endless array of common experiences of two lovers or two marriage partners that yield them satisfaction, as males and females, without involving any physical contacts. “Sexual” satisfactions are not limited to “outlet,” or to episodes ending in orgasms. The affectional life finds satisfactions in endless forms beyond the reach of a census. While the report refers to possible increase of satisfaction in a sexual relationship continued over years, there is no suggestion of mutual “conditioning” of husband and wife to satisfactions that may indeed have their sources in maleness and femaleness, but that reach beyond details involved in attaining orgasm.

Since “satisfactions” are definitely values, and since sex satisfactions appear to be the major justification for isolating the arousal-response-orgasm sequence as the unit for classifying human sex behaviour, it seems reasonable to expect of such a study that it find some way of distinguishing what

the marriage ritual can possibly mean by "love, honour and obey," from what passes for "love" in the free atmosphere of Paris, let us say, or in Russia during the early years of the Bolshevik revolution. Perhaps some of these things will come in later reports.

We must have more knowledge, more facts, about people's drives and needs as organisms, as mental and emotional systems, as social beings in continuous relationship with others and their ideas and sentiments. But as human beings we need also to be aware of the values or norms by which we appraise behaviour, and the goals to which behaviour is directed.

In any case, we may be able to get enough facts from the present report to help us to "teach" about sex without trying to unsex young people. The facts may help us to enlighten the young into asserting themselves as males or females without the need of impressing or debasing or deceiving or overcoming others.

Science and Law

It would be unfair to require of the authors of this report concrete recommendations for revising our laws or morals. Taking the facts as given, however, they do raise questions regarding the amount of "tolerance" our traditions and practices can allow. The facts regarding differences between males and females as to the age incidence of "maximum sexual capacity," for example, suggest that an ideal marriage would be between a teen-age boy and a girl in her twenties. The fact that this has never been the general custom is subordinate to the obvious fact that marriage involves not only sundry social and economic obligations, but also more subtle "psychological" factors—both intellectual and emotional—that would usually be threatened by such a marriage.

More important, however, than the immediate objections that suggest themselves is the far-reaching question whether "maximum sexual capacity" is a valid criterion for any regulation or programme. We don't think of "maximum eating capacity," for example, as a basis for feeding children or adults; or of "maximum sleeping capacity" as a basis for dividing the day's programme; or of "maximum

child-bearing capacity" as a condition of happiness or of social acceptability.

In many practical procedures we have learned to consider the "optimum" as significant, rather than the "maximum," for the simple if not obvious reason that in every concrete situation more factors are involved than the ones under immediate consideration. Changing a single factor in order to increase the quantity of some particular variable brings us to a point beyond which more of "A" ceases to result in more of "B"—that is the point of diminishing returns. If we were concerned only with getting more of "B" (say "satisfaction") and could get more and more by consuming more and more of "A" (say candy), the "maximum capacity" would be determining. But life isn't like that.

Another question raised by the facts as given in the Reports has to do with the great variability among individuals (as well as between the sexes) with regard to the quantitative need for sex "outlet." It is conceivable, for example, that a particular male requires more sexual activity than any wife can supply. Assuming that such needs are imperative, for whatever reason, we may have to tolerate a *ménage à trois*—or, theoretically, plural marriages. Eventually, an acceptance of variations in sexuality implies that almost any arrangement satisfactory to the parties immediately involved may be tolerated, if the interests of children and others affected are equally protected.

Again, however, we have to consider that while individuals differ as to needs, we must also know how flexible and adjustable, as well as unique, individuals are. If regulations have to be designed for any kind of "average," we have to be prepared to make exceptions where needed, without prejudice. And we can perhaps learn to accept the unusual, instead of forcing people to add secrecy and guilt feelings and furtiveness to their preferred patterns of living.

Besides the doctrine of sin, two of the most powerful motivations in all efforts to restrain or inhibit sexual activities were the fear of venereal diseases and the fear of undesired pregnancies. The venereal diseases are fairly well controlled by public health measures and legal restrictions that do not essentially interfere with sexual activities. The control of conception is left almost entirely to the individual and is virtually accepted for a growing fraction of the population. These facts, and the declining influence of the "conceived in

sin" type of thinking, "liberate" sex to a very large degree. The big question is—after we shall have accumulated abundant data "to measure the relative importance of companions, parents and other adults in the establishment of the child's attitudes and patterns of sex-social behaviour" (as Kinsey suggested in his first report)—will we know what we want in the way of attitudes? Will we be any better prepared to do the needed educating and conditioning?

Female facts and figures, checked, analysed and appraised

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

*Herbert Hyman, Ph.D. and
Paul B. Sheatsley, A.B.*

HERBERT HYMAN is an associate professor of sociology in the graduate faculty of Columbia University, and a specialist in the problems of public opinion and the methodology of social research. For six years Dr. Hyman and Paul Sheatsley were colleagues at the National Research Centre of the University of Chicago, and during this period they began to collaborate, publishing a number of articles on survey methodology in professional journals, including a review of the first Kinsey Report.

Dr. Hyman is a former assistant professor of psychology at Brooklyn College and has also been visiting professor at the University of Oslo and visiting lecturer at the University of California. He has acted as adviser to the Oslo Institute of Social Research, has served with the U.S. Army of Occupation in Japan as consultant on problems of public opinion and social research, and with the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey in Germany as assistant director of field surveys. In addition he has done research in his field for the Office of War Information and the Department of Agriculture.

Articles by Dr. Hyman appear frequently in many journals. His forthcoming book on the methodology of interviewing is based on a four-year research programme conducted by the National Opinion Research Centre under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. He is active in numerous professional societies, and a member of the advisory editorial boards of the *Public Opinion Quarterly* and the *Journal of Social Issues*.

PAUL B. SHEATSLEY is an expert in the field of public opinion research. For the past twelve years he has been director of the Eastern office of the National Opinion Research Centre, a non-profit research association affiliated with the University of Chicago. In this capacity he is involved in the design and execution of opinion and attitude surveys for government agencies, foundations,

universities and other non-commercial organisations, and, basic research, under foundation grants, on the improvement of survey methods.

With Herbert Hyman, Sheatsley is co-author of a number of articles dealing with survey methodology, and of a review of the first Kinsey Report. He also writes frequently for such professional journals as the *Public Opinion Quarterly*, the *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, and UNESCO's *International Social Science Bulletin*. A former newspaperman, he has also been connected with the Gallup public opinion enterprises in Princeton, New Jersey. He is a member of the executive council of both the American and the World Association for Public Opinion Research.

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

Herbert H. Hyman and Paul B. Sheatsley

The magnetic appeal of Kinsey's *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* lies, strangely enough, in its method! Great writers of literature have written of sexual behaviour more eloquently, and one can currently find in bookstores or on the magazine stands many more provocative, titillating, or detailed discussions of the subject. Yet masses of the public have turned to this long and sometimes tedious volume, with its 762 pages of text, its 155 figures of charts, replete with statistical terminology, crowded with lengthy footnotes and written in a style which is baldly matter-of-fact. Certainly some of the purchasers and readers of the volume have found themselves disappointed in their search for pleasurable reading matter, but Kinsey's place on the best-seller list testifies to the appeal of the work as *method*.

It is its claim to provide the facts in a hitherto dark area, its assertion that it offers to the reader the truth, which elevates the report both to popularity and to significance. Thus the publishers speak of Kinsey's "scientific approach" and of the "factual understanding" his work provides; and the foreword describes the study as "fact-finding through careful, patient, long-continued, objective research" and as making "a notable contribution of fact in replacement of ignorance and inadequately verified surmise." The degree to which the findings actually do represent fact and verified knowledge depends, of course, upon the quality of the methods employed, and the effectiveness of Kinsey's method therefore becomes a crucial question. Unfortunately, it will not be easy to answer this question in any simple way.

The method employed involves a whole series of steps, each of which may introduce some error into the findings, and its evaluation thus becomes complex. One must consider the representativeness of the sample of 5,940 white American females who provide the major basis for the conclusions, and examine the methods of interviewing and reporting by means

of which the information was collected. It is pertinent to inquire into the content of the interview in order to assess the adequacy of its coverage of the many different aspects and determinants of sexual behaviour. Further, one must consider the ways in which the original data were classified and tabulated, and one must then examine the validity of the analyses and inferences which resulted. Distortions introduced through faulty techniques in any of these stages could seriously affect the nature of the reported findings. But a proper evaluation of Kinsey's method requires also that one refer in a parallel way to the methods employed in the earlier volume on sexual behaviour in the male. For unlike the first Report, the present work is not merely a discrete description of female behaviour. A large part of its significance lies in the *comparisons* it provides between the female's sexual behaviour and that of the male, and evaluation of these comparative data requires an examination of both volumes. It will be demonstrated later that if the methods differ from one to another, the validity of the comparisons is affected. If the methods employed are the same, distortions may nevertheless result if a particular method is appropriate for one sex but not for the other.

Moreover, there are no simple obvious standards which can be applied to these matters of research method. One cannot categorically assert that the sampling or interviewing techniques are "good" or "bad." A method which is good from one standpoint is often bad from another; compromises must always be made. Even the best methods still contain sources of error: even faulty methods may still produce useful or promising findings. It is clear, therefore, that no one should regard Kinsey's reports as inaccurate or irrelevant because of inevitable weaknesses of method; nor should they be accepted as precise final answers just because they employ more advanced and elaborate methods than have previous studies in this area. In the limited space available here, we shall try to discover just where the balance lies.

Inevitability of Error

It should be recognised that fallibility is characteristic of all empirical research. Any investigation of whatever sort in-

volves the danger of limited or unrepresentative coverage, of error in observation or reports, of faulty inferences drawn from the findings, and the like. Since no research can ever be perfect, one might almost argue that a distinctive feature of good research is the awareness and acknowledgment of error. The important thing is for the investigator to recognise the limitations of his study, to report them to his audience, and to qualify his conclusions where necessary in the light of those defects. This Kinsey does, to an admirable extent.

In his first sentence he refers to the work as a "progress report," and in the next sentence he says "an attempt has been made to discover what people do sexually." Throughout the text are many explicit references to the limitations of various aspects of his total method: "The sample is still, at many points, inadequate. . . . At its best, the present volume can pretend to report behaviour which may be typical of no more than a portion, although probably not an inconsiderable portion, of the white females living within the boundaries of the United States. . . . In general, the incidence data are more reliable than the frequency data. . . . We have had to be satisfied with rough estimates of the frequencies of petting experience. . . . It is a prime weakness of statistical averages that they suggest a regularity in the occurrence of activities which do not actually occur with any regularity. . . . It cannot be emphasised too often that orgasm cannot be taken as the sole criterion for determining the degree of satisfaction which a female may derive from sexual activity. . . . The sexual history of each individual represents a unique combination of these variables. . . . Unfortunately our record on extra-marital petting is incomplete, for we did not realise the extent of such activity when this study first began. . . . It would be surprising if we, the present investigators, should have wholly freed ourselves from such century-old biases and succeeded in comparing the two sexes with the complete objectivity which is possible in areas of science that are of less direct import in human affairs." These constitute only a small sample of the many cautions which Kinsey provides throughout his work as he presents his findings. The sample, the interview technique, the design of the study, the interpretation of the results—none of these is regarded as immune to error, and the reader is duly warned of whatever limitations exist in the data. It is true, of course, that a limitation is still a limitation, whether

it is made explicit or not. But if it is made explicit it can be taken into account; if it is concealed, the reader is misled. Much credit is due Kinsey and his colleagues for this example of scientific integrity.

One must consider furthermore that many of the limitations in Kinsey's data are inevitable, and indeed often deliberate. Viewed in this light, some of the criticisms that are ventured against the volume seem misplaced. Any measure of a complex phenomenon clarifies only an aspect of it, and obscures other aspects; in no other way can it be measured. The use of such summarising measures as the mean or median, for example, or the use of orgasm as the primary index of sexual activity, represent calculated decisions on Kinsey's part. Another investigator might approach the problem in another way, but any approach would inevitably have its own limitations. In making these decisions, Kinsey had to calculate the advantages as opposed to the disadvantages of each particular method, and choose the procedure which seemed most promising. In each case he explicitly states the reasons for his choice of procedure and calls the reader's attention to its limitations, and this is all that can be expected of any investigator.

One plausible standard to apply to this volume is the level of improvement in the methods employed, as compared with the earlier Report on the Male. For Kinsey began his exploration of the complexities of sexual behaviour some fifteen years ago without benefit of much guidance. He had to find his way, and his first Report would of necessity reflect some of his earlier mistakes. But the many criticisms of the first volume and additional experience in handling this type of data should have netted an improvement in the present work. That this is actually the case seems beyond question to the present reviewers. It is clear that Kinsey must have taken very careful note of his earlier critics and that he has remedied a number of the defects which were pointed out in his first Report.

But one must realise that many complexities attend any changes or improvements which he might introduce as a result of more recent experience. For example, while it may appear that the volume on the Female has the benefit of five years of additional work, this is obviously not the case. Both inquiries started in 1938, and "throughout the years, female histories have been added at approximately the same rate as the histories

of males." This would be essential in any costly field research, since it would be wasteful of time and money to make separate trips to each community in order to interview first men and then women. As a result, Kinsey's sampling and interviewing procedures can hardly have been altered at all. What is subject to change are the analytic procedures, since the data on the female were processed and reported at a later date. But even here changes cannot be made lightly. As we noted earlier, the volume on the female is not a mere descriptive report on the sex, as was the first volume. In addition, it *compares* the findings for males with those for females, and herein lies its special significance for our society. For it provides evidence on the *socio-sexual* sphere by giving us *comparative* sexual profiles of boys and girls, women and men, and it is these comparative data rather than the separate profiles of each sex which give rise to many of the larger social questions raised by Kinsey's findings. It is obvious, however, that this tremendous advance in the second volume can come about only in so far as the procedures which yielded both sets of data remain relatively constant. Any differences in research techniques between the two would bring about a dilemma in which whatever differences were discovered could be attributable either to true differences in the behaviour of the sexes or merely to differences in the research methods. Consequently one must consider carefully before throwing away a valuable comparison by changing a method, even if the new method is superior. It is as if one had a scale which was found to exaggerate the weight of everything placed upon it. The scale would not report men's weight accurately and it would not report women's weight accurately, but it would nevertheless report the true difference between the two. If the scale were later adjusted so that one group but not the other was weighed correctly, the comparisons would be obscured. But bearing in mind the difficulties involved in making changes in his method for this second volume, Kinsey has clearly endeavoured to effect whatever improvements were possible and desirable.

The Sample

Careful reviewers of the first volume questioned Kinsey's right to draw generalisations concerning the whole American

male population from his limited sample of 5,300 interviews. Such generalisations did appear insupportable, not because of the sample size but on a number of other grounds. The method of selecting respondents did not follow any systematic design which would insure proper representation of all types of males. The attempt to correct the resultant biases by giving greater weight to those groups which were under-represented was subject to considerable error, for a variety of technical reasons. Even the statements about probable error due to sampling variance appeared questionable because the technique for calculating such error implicitly assumed a random or systematic selection of cases. In the present volume Kinsey is very cautious about his generalisations, and he makes no attempt at all to extend his findings to all American women. Again, one of the most telling criticisms of his first Report was that no one could tell how good or bad his sample actually was because nowhere was there any systematic account of the distribution of the 5,300 males in terms of such factors as age, religion, etc. This defect has been remedied in the second Report by means of two elaborate tables which present all the information needed to determine the exact composition of the sample of 5,940 white females.

But while Kinsey has this time provided us with the two helpful tables which permit a general appraisal of the quality of his sample, and while he has carefully refrained from making unsupported generalisations, it remains a fact that neither his sample of men nor that of women accurately represents even the white population of this one nation, and both combined are far from a representative picture of the "human male and female." Some critics have condemned the whole sampling design, arguing that a more systematic and precise method could have been devised which would have permitted unqualified statements about the population as a whole. The question is debatable. In the first volume Kinsey acknowledged this point, but argued that any scientific selection of pre-designated respondents would have distorted the validity of the data, because a high proportion of such selected individuals could not be counted upon to give their consent to the interview and to answer the questions truthfully.

In the present volume, it seems to us that he elaborates his argument even more effectively. He is at pains to assure us that while all his respondents were "volunteers" in the

sense that they allowed themselves to be interviewed, no histories were accepted simply because a subject expressed the desire to be interviewed, and all the respondents were selected because of their importance to the overall sampling design. Kinsey works primarily through formal or informal groups, and makes ingenious and skilful use of group pressures and group loyalties. Often, after he has gained the confidence of one or two leaders of a group, the rank and file become willing interviewees. In almost all cases, once the less confident members of the group see that their friends have been interviewed with no untoward results or embarrassment, they, too, become willing to give their consent. Kinsey describes some group contacts which required a year or two of cultivation before he started getting interviews, and the immense diversity of groups he has worked with, ranging from the religious to the underworld, is a tribute to his persistence and skill.

Granted the difficulties and perhaps the impossibility of any system of random or probability sampling, and granted the ingenuity and care with which Kinsey pursued his sampling of groups, one must still raise grave questions concerning the validity of his method. For one thing, a substantial portion of the U.S. population claim no formal group membership whatever; their social life is confined to their own families and a small circle of close friends who similarly lack group ties. Such individuals would almost automatically be excluded from Kinsey's samples, and there is evidence that they differ in many respects, perhaps including sexual behaviour, from their neighbours who do belong to clubs, groups and associations. Of considerably greater importance is the fact that Kinsey could seldom interview all or nearly all of the members of any particular group. No figures are given on the proportion of "refusals" to be interviewed, though Kinsey does state that fifteen per cent of the female sample is composed of "100 per cent groups"—that is, groups in which every member was interviewed—and "we may report that a considerable proportion of the rest of the sample has been drawn from groups in which something between fifty and ninety per cent of all the members had contributed histories." Kinsey goes on to say, "Such coverage should provide a good sample of those particular groups," but this is a very dubious assumption.

There is no reason at all to believe that the histories of the ten to fifty per cent who do not contribute would necessarily

agree with those of the majority who do. One of the principal findings of the Kinsey Reports, and to many their most controversial and significant finding, has been the high incidences and frequencies of both sanctioned and unsanctioned forms of sexual behaviour reported by both men and women. It seems to us that a legitimate question arises in this connection. Might not those who agree to an interview by Dr. Kinsey be those very individuals whose sexual attitudes and behaviour are less inhibited and who have consequently engaged in more different types of sexual activity and with higher frequencies? Conversely, might not those who refuse their consent to the interview be individuals whose sexual behaviour and attitudes are much more restrained? The question is unanswerable on the basis of the data, but if the point is a valid one, Kinsey's reported findings are subject to considerable downward revision, with attendant consequences on his conclusions.

Aside from this consideration, it is puzzling that Kinsey's sample of women is not more nearly representative than it is in respect to a number of gross characteristics. Perhaps the most striking deficiency is the failure to interview enough females with no more than a grammar-school education. Some of the most interesting differences in male sexual behaviour were those attributed to education, and one would have expected comparative data on this important point in the present study. Instead, we find that only a tiny three per cent of the women interviewed had not attended high school, and Kinsey carefully and with reluctance is compelled to refrain from making any substantial statements about this large group. On the other hand, seventy-five per cent of the total female sample had attended college, and a surprising nineteen per cent—practically one woman in five—had gone on to post-graduate work. The latter is surely a rather unique group to sample so heavily, and without apparent reason. The significance of Kinsey's findings for women must be considerably diluted when we consider that three-fourths of his sample was composed of the thirteen per cent of American women who have gone to college, and that the forty per cent who never went beyond the eighth grade comprised only three per cent of those he studied. Similarly, the sample is deficient in the older age groups and heavily weighted with women in their 30's. Some of these sampling biases have been deliberate, in order to build up a sufficiently large sample of particular sub-groups

to permit generalisations about those groups. Thus, although Jews represent only about four per cent of the U.S. population, they account for more than one quarter of Kinsey's sample. But in order to make any statements about the effect of religion on sexual behaviour, Kinsey required a large enough sample of Jews to allow a thorough analysis of this religious group. In the case of the age and education biases, however, this reason does not seem relevant, and we can only wonder at the failure to achieve more adequate representation in terms of these two important factors.

Obviously one cannot dismiss Kinsey's penetrating study simply because the size and distribution of his sample does not permit him to speak authoritatively about every group in the population. However, one feature of the present volume does raise a new concern about the sampling method, and that is the comparative analysis of male and female behaviour. Many statistical data demonstrating sex differences are presented in convenient tabular form, and their impact is powerful. But a problem which continually arises in the interpretation of these comparative findings, and which is not stressed by Kinsey, is the degree to which the stated differences represent true differences in the behaviour of the two sexes, and the degree to which they merely represent differential sampling biases in the two sets of data.

As we remarked in our analogy of the defective scale, if the biases are constant for both men and women, the stated differences are none the less true. Thus, if both samples, let us say, included too many educated persons, we could still say with truth that the sexes behaved differently, even though we would have to restrict our statement largely to the educated groups. But if the male sample is biased in one respect (say, too many uneducated or too many older persons) and the females in an opposite respect (too many educated or too many younger), then the interpretation of any differences found in the data becomes very difficult. Since the overall composition of the male sample was never reported in the first volume, the facts cannot be established, but our own attempts to infer this composition from scattered tables lead us to believe that some of the sex differences reported in the current study may be artifacts of differential sampling biases. Thus, almost thirty per cent of the women are Jewish, while our best estimate of the men would place only about fifteen per cent in

that class. Only three per cent of the women are in the grammar school group, but a much larger proportion of the men. If religious affiliation or education is significantly correlated with both male and female sexual behaviour, as they sometimes are, the differential biases in the two samples could well explain some of the aggregate sex differences reported.

The problem is complicated, however, and our criticism is not as annihilating as it might seem. Kinsey presents much evidence in support of the hypothesis that female sexual behaviour is less affected by many of the social characteristics studied than is male behaviour. If this be so, a bias with respect to one of these factors could not account for very much of the difference reported. Furthermore, Kinsey presents in summary form in the Female volume and in detail in the two separate volumes the male and female findings for each of the various sub-groups, so that by comparing the equivalent age, educational, religious groups, etc., the careful reader can determine for himself the degree to which the biases may affect the overall differences cited. Nevertheless, any differential biases with respect to characteristics other than those tabulated might still remain as an unknown source of error in the comparisons. Thus, Kinsey states that female sexual behaviour is subject to much greater *variability* than the male. This variability, however, appears in all of the female sub-groups for which data are presented. Since some characteristic must determine the variation among females, and its identity does not appear in the analysis of the data, any differential sampling bias in this unknown respect might well contribute to a spurious finding. Kinsey does present some empirical evidence bearing on this problem when he shows a close agreement in the male and female findings with respect to marital coitus, for example. The frequencies of marital coitus would, by definition, have to be identical in the aggregate for the two samples if the samples were equivalent. In many instances, a very high degree of agreement is reported, but for some few aspects of behaviour the reports of the two samples do not closely conform. The data suggest, therefore, that our speculative criticism is not generally warranted, although some limited number of the differences reported may reflect to some degree the net operation of all differential biases in the sampling of the two groups.

The Interview and the Interviewers

As in the case of the males, approximately two hours were spent interviewing each subject and covering between 300 and 500 items of information. No questionnaire was presented in the first volume, nor is one presented in this volume. This absence effectively prevents one from appraising the types of questions that Kinsey asked and the manner in which they were presented. One is never certain, for example, whether particular data have been elicited as a result of spontaneous mention by the respondent, or in reply to specific suggestions by the interviewer, or only after lengthy and detailed probing. The critic is unable to judge for himself the precautions taken against exaggeration or cover-up of particular sexual activities, or the possible biases in the way the questions were put. While this omission is perhaps less important in the case of the factual questions on objective behaviour, it makes evaluation of the attitudinal material very difficult. In the realm of subjective reports on opinions, beliefs and feelings, it is well known that variations in the wording and form of the question can significantly affect the answers received.

Actually, Kinsey argues persuasively in opposition to the belief that "standard questions fed through diverse human machines can bring standard answers," and he used no questionnaire at all in the usual sense of the word. Interviewers had a check list of items to be covered, and the definition of each item was standard, but the wording and order of the particular questions were varied in the most meaningful manner for each respondent. In seeking the ideal setting for each individual interview, Kinsey expected to obtain a real or functional equivalence among all of them—and more so than if he had asked the same question-wordings of each diverse individual. There is much to be said for this technique, since a phrase which means one thing to one group may have a different meaning for another group, a question which is clear to a certain segment of the public may be entirely beyond another segment, and so on. But the dilemma is that when the objective conditions of the interview are not uniform, one can never be certain that the differences found between individuals and groups are not due, at least in part, to differences in the wording and order of the questions. This consideration takes

on added weight in connection with the present Report, of which one of the most valuable features is the many comparisons between males and females. For every one of these comparisons, the question of consistency of interviewing procedure might be raised, but unfortunately can never be answered.

Offsetting this possible danger was the fact that all of the interviewing was done by a very small staff of highly trained interviewers. If one hundred interviewers, operating under loose supervision and not completely aware of the precise objectives of each item of the inquiry, were allowed to improvise their interview procedure, the results would merit little confidence. But eight-five per cent of the male interviews were collected by only two interviewers, and approximately eighty per cent of the female. A total of only six interviewers were used for the Male volume, and only four for the Female. With each of these interviewers thoroughly indoctrinated in the study, with close and continuing contact among them at all times, and with their years of experience in handling this type of interview with every sort of individual, one can assume that their procedures were much more uniform than might appear, in spite of the large measure of freedom given to each to exercise his judgment from case to case.

Kinsey presents a variety of evidence bearing on the quality of the interview data. He cites the cases of 124 females, for example, who were reinterviewed after a minimum time lapse of eighteen months. Compared with other studies of the reliability of interview reports on much less emotional issues than sexual behaviour, the extent of agreement between the first and second interviews is remarkably high. It is apparent that in most areas the answers have a very high degree of reliability. The validity of the responses is examined by comparing the results obtained from separate interviews with 706 pairs of spouses, where by definition any disagreement in reports on their marital history and behaviour would constitute invalidity. Again, the general findings are good, and compared with equivalent validity studies in the interview literature, they are often amazingly good. It should be noted, however, that such validity checks have been confined to spouses whose joint sexual behaviour is more or less "sanctioned." It is not demonstrated whether the same degree of validity holds for the less sanctioned areas of behaviour, such as the homosexual or extra-marital.

In the *first* volume, Kinsey further presented comparative data obtained by three different interviewers, from presumably equivalent groups of respondents. Again the differences were small, and indicated that the interviewers were performing in a uniform way. In another test cited in volume I, the results of interviews obtained by one interviewer, Kinsey himself, over two different time periods, were compared, and again equivalence was noted. It appears then that for this one interviewer who collected most of the histories, there was no substantial variation in performance over the years. No such inter-interviewer or temporal comparisons are reported for the female cases, perhaps because Kinsey felt the points had already been established. Yet it is conceivable that the male interviewers who behaved in a uniform manner in their interviews with other men may have performed idiosyncratically in their interviews with females, and thus introduced an element of bias. A repetition of such tests would have been simple, and one wishes the data had been presented.

Perhaps a more important consideration in evaluating the interview material lies in the sex of the interviewers employed, all of whom were males. There is a considerable body of evidence to the effect that the group membership of the interviewer may, in many types of studies, seriously affect the responses given. Thus, Negroes have been shown to give different answers to white interviewers than to interviewers of their own race. Working class individuals have been demonstrated to answer differently to white-collar interviewers than to interviewers of their own class. And pertinent to the point we raise here is the fact that men and women have been observed to give different replies, on many questions, depending upon the sex of the interviewer. True, such studies have also shown that the more experienced and capable interviewers have been able to some extent to overcome the effects of their social and biological characteristics, and we would expect such effects to be at a minimum with the interviewers of the calibre of Kinsey and his associates. But the possibility has been established that statistical results can easily vary by as much as ten percentage points, depending upon the sex of the interviewer, and one has no way of measuring in this study the possible effects resulting from the fact that all four interviewers were males and interviewing females. The problem could have been easily examined by means of a small experimental study

employing one or more female interviewers on a sub-sampling basis, but in the absence of such data, one can only speculate on the possible effects. Kinsey does compare the consistency of reports among the sub-sample of males and females who were reinterviewed after a lapse of time, and the data reveal no consistent differences in the stability of replies given by the two sexes. This establishes the fact that the females did not answer the male interviewers any more capriciously or less reliably than did the males, but it could still be that on both interview occasions their responses had less validity than those of the males.

The Quality of the Reports

Various criticisms of Kinsey's research have been advanced, and will continue to be advanced, on sheer axiomatic grounds. The claim is made that data concerning people's most intimate experiences, many of which may be socially disapproved, or aspects of their history which are remote in time, when collected by straightforward question and answer procedures in a relatively short interview, cannot possibly be accurate. Some critics have argued that such material must inevitably be distorted by emotional and psychodynamic factors beyond the subject's control, even were he completely willing to co-operate to the fullest extent. There are others who say that no ordinary interviewing techniques can elicit such intimate data, and that one must have recourse to projective tests, psychiatric procedures and the like. At this level the arguments are not susceptible to proof or disproof, and rest on the particular views or prejudices of the critic.

It is true that one's credulity is occasionally strained by a reported datum which Kinsey presents without qualification. He cites, for example, in the same breath and without distinction, data concerning early masturbation experience which are collected in some cases by actual observation and in other cases by remote recall: "We have records of sixty-seven infants and small girls *three years of age or younger* who were observed in masturbation or *who as adults recalled that they had masturbated at that age.*" He plots a curve of the incidence of masturbation to orgasm with increasing age, and a similar curve showing the incidence of nocturnal dreams to orgasm,

including in the data reports on early childhood experience approximately forty years ago by females born before 1900. There are references to individual females who have masturbated to orgasm "ten, twenty and even one hundred times within a single hour," and to others who may have had "as many as a dozen or more orgasms in a relationship in which her husband has ejaculated only once." One hesitates whether to marvel more at the feat or at the accuracy of the count.

But such occasional items do not seriously affect the main body of the findings. With respect to criticisms of Kinsey's data which are based on a priori or axiomatic grounds, it seems to us that the burden of proof rests with the critics. Kinsey himself, as we previously noted, has made many earnest and ingenious efforts to test his data, and cites considerable empirical support for the quality of his material. Reliability is high, as measured by reinterviews after a considerable lapse of time. Agreement in the independent reports of spouses concerning their joint behaviour is high. There is some evidence that even events which occurred many years ago and are remote in the respondent's memory are nevertheless enumerated with considerable accuracy. Thus, Kinsey's findings on age of menarche and other indices of physical development, as reported retrospectively by his respondents, agree closely with independent studies based on direct observation of these matters. High agreement is demonstrated between many of his findings and the findings of earlier independent investigators who relied on different techniques. The material from the reinterviews and from the interviews with spouses concerning matters remote in time is somewhat less reliable than their reports of more recent events, but is still surprisingly good. None of these tests constitutes a perfect answer, of course, and none of the data is perfect, but it is hard to see how one could reasonably ask for more. The critic who refuses to find an answer to his criticisms at such a level, and who simply insists that the data cannot possibly represent the truth, would seem to hold a somewhat arbitrary position.

Lewis Terman, in a distinguished review of the earlier volume, noted with some justice that Kinsey, in processing and analysing his data, had not taken proper account of possible memory errors. Terman did not completely reject the material collected by remote recall, but he argued against

Kinsey's procedure, when describing sexual behaviour at given ages, of lumping the reports of respondents actually at that age at the time of interview with the reports of those who had to recall the same period from their early lives. He noted that "In the computation of mean frequency of masturbation at age fifteen, for example, the memory report of a fifty-year-old counts as heavily as the report of a fifteen-year-old. . . . It would have been helpful if he had shown in the tables what proportion of the N at that given age level was accounted for by subjects at or near that age. . . . For all we know . . . the data for the lower ages in the table may all be based on the memory reports of older subjects, many of them twenty, thirty or forty years older." What Terman asked was merely that the data be so analysed and presented that this possible source of error could be noted and weighed by the reader. In the present volume Kinsey again lumps retrospective and current reports in his analyses of particular types of behaviour by age (as he would have to if the data were to be reported at all) but he has this time provided tables showing the age distribution at time of report, not only for his total sample of females, but also for particular sub-groups. This constitutes an important improvement, for the critical reader can now weigh for himself the vulnerability of certain of the data in the light of possible memory distortions.

Types of Data Collected

Critics of the earlier volume, and very likely of this volume, too, have often concerned themselves with Kinsey's definition of the concept of sexual behaviour and with his emphasis on orgasm as the unit of measurement of such behaviour. In both the content of the interview itself and in his treatment of the data, Kinsey has sometimes been accused of attempting to reduce all the complexities of sexual life to a series of statistics on the overt aspects of sexual behaviour. And it is true that by and large, Kinsey has approached his problem in these terms. However, it would seem proper to distinguish a legitimate research limitation from an error or weakness which merits criticism. Limitations are characteristic of all investigations, for no scientist can make a problem manageable without reducing its complexity in some manner. It is the scientist's

prerogative and even his duty to define a complex problem in the particular way which suits his resources and which appears most fruitful. What is required is that he clearly indicate how he has defined it, and the limitations which have thereby been imposed, and this Kinsey has done. He states on many occasions, for example, his awareness that measures of such overt experience as orgasm do not encompass the entire area of the problem, but he argues persuasively that such objective measures of overt behaviour were the best he could accomplish at this time. In this light, it appears that many of the comments regarding his reliance on the incidences and frequencies of orgasm, to the neglect of more subtle aspects of sexual behaviour, and his employment of routine statistical methods in order to reduce the thousands of individual-reports to some over-all clarity and compactness, are not warranted as criticism. They proceed more from offence to the reader's prejudices than from logic. The limitations are recognised by Kinsey and their reasons explained.

A scientist may be subject to legitimate criticism, however, if his methods are inappropriate for the study of the problem as he has defined it, or if he goes beyond his definition of the problem, and speaks on aspects of it which are outside his data. It is our feeling that Kinsey has generally chosen the most efficient procedures available to him, but that he may be somewhat vulnerable on the second score. In his first volume, for example, virtually no direct data were collected on the psychological processes underlying the overt male sexual behaviour which he reported, and without such data some of the findings were uninterpretable. In some cases this was frankly confessed, but in other cases Kinsey found himself venturing his own personal conjectures of the psychological processes involved and of the probable social effects. For this he could be justly criticised; in the absence of precise data, his interpretation became merely a personal opinion. In the present volume, where Kinsey seems even more concerned with interpreting the underlying meaning of his findings, commenting on psychological processes as they differentiate males and females, and even making recommendations for social action, there is all the more need for such auxiliary data. It appears to us that Kinsey has been acutely aware of this need, and has improved greatly on the earlier volume. In contrast to the *Report on the Male*, the present study makes considerable use

of attitudinal and psychological data collected directly from the interviews.

We might cite a few illustrations of this nature to show how the psychological material permits one to make a better inference than the bare record of overt behaviour. Following a discussion of homosexual behaviour, for example, there is a tabulation of the degree of regret, if any, which the subjects felt concerning their homosexual experience. Following a discussion of the incidence of masturbation, there is presented evidence on the degree to which psychological disturbance had accompanied the activity. Following a discussion of sexual contacts between adults and children, there is cited certain information on the psychological reactions of the children. Such data obviously permit a better appraisal of the consequences of various kinds of sexual activities in our society than the mere statistical incidences and frequencies of such activities. Nevertheless, Kinsey will undoubtedly be attacked by many critics who disagree with his findings or with the implications he sees in them. When these critics ignore the deliberate limitations he places on his results, or when they deny all validity to his methods, we would consider their remarks unjustified. When they find instances in which Kinsey himself has ignored his self-imposed limitations or in which he has put forward personal views unsupported by the data he has collected, we would tend to side with the critics. Scientific knowledge of one aspect of a complex problem, we are sure Kinsey would agree, does not entitle the investigator to speak authoritatively on all aspects of it.

In addition to the new data on attitudes, intentions and feelings, there is acute use of auxiliary materials from an immense variety of sources in other fields. Anthropological biological, physiological, medical, historical and literary data on sexual behaviour are profusely and effectively cited to support the findings and interpretations drawn from Kinsey's own original materials. The expanded use of such supplementary data in this current report strikes us as a major contribution to the understanding of Kinsey's work in perspective. For the most part, we are not competent to evaluate the substantive data which Kinsey cites from these other fields, but we do note one recurring feature in the citations which may mislead the casual reader. In his analysis of his interview materials, Kinsey repeatedly notes a considerable strain on the

society imposed by the discrepancies between the actual private sexual behaviour of men and women, and the legal and social controls which penalise any sexual deviation, and insist on strict conformance to traditional codes. Kinsey makes much of this discrepancy in connection with almost every aspect of his findings, and he adduces much anthropological evidence to show that other societies have condoned various forms of sexual deviance which are subject to legal punishment or social ostracism in the United States. The manifest implication, it seems to us, is that other societies and cultures allow a much greater degree of sexual freedom than does the United States, and that our own society is subject to unnecessary and harmful strains as a result of the controls which we try to apply to perfectly normal sexual activities.

But one must distinguish between the total extent of sexual freedom in any society, and the particular activities which are permitted or tabooed. Most of the anthropological data presented throughout the book merely establish differences in the *channeling* of sexual activity, and do not by themselves provide support for the notion that the United States generally inhibits such activity more than other societies. But the piecemeal citation of the several societies which sanction each type of activity tends to mislead the reader. By way of illustration, we note Kinsey's reference to the fact that a variety of primitive societies condone pre-adolescent sex-play, including coitus. Among these societies, he lists that of Alor, where the primary sources indicate, for example, that mothers masturbate their children to quiet them. By implication, and particularly when such examples are multiplied, the reader might feel that these societies impose much less restraint on sexual matters than our own culture does. But full examination of the ethnographic reports on Alorese society reveals such facts as the following: "A girl will often deny herself sexually to her husband for some time after marriage." From about eight years to adolescence "the free masturbation of childhood disappears after the acquisition of a loin-cloth, when children imitate the modesty of the adults." With respect to youth, it is noted that "a lad who becomes involved with a woman may precipitate a scandal and be forced to marry." "The men themselves are often extremely inhibited sexually. . . . For a woman to touch the man's genitalia is considered completely shameless. . . . The approach to the woman is filled with shyness and anxiety. The

woman generally makes the first sexual advance. It is also of significance that rape is unknown." The example documents the distinction that we feel is neglected to the reader's disadvantage in the use of auxiliary materials in the segmental fashion. Alorése society certainly condones pre-adolescent sex-play, but the total picture suggests an otherwise highly restrained sexual activity.

Analytic Techniques

The analytic procedures employed for the Female Report conform closely to the pattern established in the first volume, with certain additional procedures which are specially suited to the new problems. In general, sexual behaviour is described in terms of the incidences and frequencies of experience, and of experience to orgasm, in each of the several defined types of sexual activity; pre-adolescent sex-play, masturbation, nocturnal dreams, heterosexual petting, pre-marital coitus, marital coitus, extra-marital coitus, post-marital coitus, homosexual contacts, and animal contacts. The individual figures for each type of activity and the "total sexual outlet" from all types are then explained by examination of the variations in such behaviour for different age, religious, educational, marital and similar groups. These explanatory factors are the same ones used in the analysis of the male data, and the approach has proved a fruitful one, for the differences reported from one group to another have greatly increased our understanding of the factors affecting sexual behaviour. In defining his groups, too, Kinsey has adopted a very perceptive approach. In his consideration of religious affiliation, for example, he has not stopped with the routine comparisons of Protestants, Catholics and Jews, but he has also considered the degree of religious devotion of the adherents to each faith, and this refinement has led to a whole series of exciting findings which would otherwise have been obscured.

The statistical analyses are also handled in a technically sophisticated manner. As one might suspect, when differences are observed between groups which are contrasted in a particular respect, there is always the chance that the differences may not be due to the so-called explanatory factor, but to some other factor which accompanies the original characteristic.

The classic solution to this problem lies in the technique of "control," so that the contrasted groups are matched in other respects as well, thus increasing the likelihood that any differences observed are actually due to the hypothesised factor. Thus, in comparing the behaviour of younger and older women, for instance, there is the danger that any difference observed may be due not to age, but to marital status, since the older are more likely to be married. Similarly, in studying the influence of marital status on sexual behaviour, any differences found between the married and single might be due to age. Again, differences that seem attributable to educational level might be due to the fact that those who go on to higher education are less likely to marry at an early age. Kinsey carefully examines his material for such spurious "findings," and systematically controls for certain factors which seem to be correlated with the characteristic under study. When he has insufficient cases to pursue such analyses as far as necessary, he is careful to qualify his conclusions. Similarly, he is careful not to assume that a simple correlation necessarily represents cause and effect. He finds, for example, that girls with premarital coital experience are more likely to engage in extra-marital activity; but he notes that selective factors, in which the girls with early experience are perhaps the more responsive sexually, may account for the finding.

Presentation of the detailed breakdowns by sub-groups has additional values. First, it enables the reader to judge for himself the probable effect of the sampling biases which we have noted. If Jewish women, for example, have a sexual pattern which is markedly different from the other religious groups, the fact that Kinsey's sample is overweighted with Jewish women would affect his aggregate figures; and the same thing would be true for other groups which might differ considerably from the norm and which might be heavily over- or under-represented in the sample. It is on this basis that Kinsey argues that the heavy preponderance of college women in his sample is not unduly serious, since in general he finds little difference among the high school, college and graduate school groups. He does, however, state that "major changes might have been introduced into the generalisations if we had had a larger sample of females who had never gone beyond grade school."

The use of the same social characteristics to examine the sexual activity of both males and females also has a major

importance. It enables the reader to compare not only the differences between men and women in the aggregate, but also differences between men and women within specific sub-groups; e.g., educated, Catholic, rural, etc. This is obviously a much more precise approach to an evaluation of what is perhaps the major contribution of Kinsey's second Report—the social conflicts which may arise because of the discrepant sexual patterns he finds in male and female partners. For in marriage and in social life generally, it is well established that people normally interact within limited social groupings. They do not usually date, marry or seek extra-marital satisfaction at random; quite regularly they choose a partner within their own community, their own social class, their own age group. Consequently, the important facts to be adduced in consideration of the problem raised by Kinsey's comparative findings are the patterns among men and women who are likely to meet, rather than the average patterns of men and women in general. While these parallel analyses by the same social groupings are therefore very valuable, it is our feeling that Kinsey does not sufficiently use them for their obvious purpose. Most of the conclusions about the social conflicts arising from the different patterns of sexual behaviour in men and women seem to be predicated solely on the averages for the samples as a whole, rather than on the distinctive patterns of the parallel sub-groups who are most likely to become sexual partners.

To illustrate: Kinsey finds that the total number of men who at one time or another engaged in pre-marital coitus approximates the level of ninety per cent, while among women the figure is fifty per cent. He uses this discrepancy in his interpretation of the rise of the double standard in sexual matters, and often refers to the greater sexuality of young males as compared with young females as creating social strains and conflicts. But when the incidence of pre-marital coitus is examined in terms of the separate educational levels, we find that among the college educated men the figure drops to sixty-eight per cent, and among the similarly educated women the female figure rises to sixty per cent. Among this particular group, therefore, a group within which both the males and females are more likely to find their sexual partners, the extent of difference between the sexes in their behaviour tends to disappear. In the lower educational levels, the conflict would appear to be widened, and such differences perhaps affect the interpretation

which should be placed on the overall finding. Parallel comparisons for particular matched sub-groups could probably be adduced in many other areas of sexual activity, though as we have noted, Kinsey tends to rest his own comparisons solely on the characteristics of his two total samples. It should be noted, however, that while it is theoretically possible, through reference to the Report on the Male, to make detailed subgroup comparisons between the sexes, the present reviewers found the task extraordinarily difficult. Partly this difficulty results from the fact that many of the male findings are "weighted" to bring them into conformance to the presumed national male population, while the female figures are unweighted; partly it develops from the fact that the tabular material in the Male Report, as noted by many critics, was unevenly presented and often created hardship for the interested reader who sought a particular datum on a particular activity among a particular sub-group.

While a parallel use of the same social characteristics in the analysis of the behaviour of both sexes has the substantial values just mentioned, we do find it strange that the feminine analysis should have been so rigidly restricted to those factors only. The aim of any comprehensive study of a phenomenon is to throw light on its determinants, so that it can be completely and accurately understood. Now there are obvious social characteristics of American women which are presumably central to their behaviour, and which are not comprehended at all under the traditional groupings by age, education, religion, etc., which were used for the male. It will probably occur to any reader that one manifest determinant of a large area of feminine behaviour is the presence or absence of motherhood, and the extent to which a woman must care for children. Another clearly apparent social characteristic which affects many aspects of woman's behaviour is her status as an independent wage-earner, or as a dependent non-working wife or daughter. Conceivably these factors have no relation to sexual behaviour, but the presumption is so strong that they do, and they have been so saliently mentioned in most discussions of the problem, that we find it disappointing that their effects are not reported on in the present volume. It is even conceivable that the interpretation of some of the differences within the female sample, and of some of the differences between males and females which are now attributed to other

factors would be substantially revised, if we could determine the effects of such characteristics as we have named and examine the representativeness of Kinsey's sample in that light. Is it not likely, for example, that the large group of women with post-graduate training are for the most part professionally employed? If this be so, the nature and frequency of their sexual activities may implicitly reflect their occupational status rather than some of the other factors which have been examined. And were this found to be true, their heavy over-representation in Kinsey's sample would tend to distort the overall findings.

There is one mode of analysis employed in this volume which adds immeasurably to the significance of the report. The study of sexual behaviour in terms of the standard social categories represents an inherently static approach to what is essentially a dynamic problem. An individual's education or religion or place of residence is a relatively fixed characteristic, often extending throughout his lifetime in the course of which his behaviour may change radically. Analysis in such terms is valuable, but it cannot answer many interesting questions of a more dynamic nature. How, for example, do particular early sexual experiences affect later adjustment? How do people who engage in one type of sexual activity behave with respect to other activities? Kinsey in both of his studies had the reconstructed lifetime sexual activity of each of his respondents and could consequently interrelate these facts of behaviour in a more organic kind of analysis. In the first volume the potentialities of these materials seemed very little exploited, but in the present Report they are most skilfully used, and particularly for an effective analysis of the relation between masturbation and pre-marital coitus and subsequent adjustment in marriage, as measured by the occurrence of orgasm in marital coitus. These analyses will probably be among the most controversial in the work, for they provide the major basis for Kinsey's conclusion that "early orgasmic experience may, therefore, contribute directly to the sexual effectiveness of a marriage." The author is careful to point out that selective factors, rather than a cause-and-effect relationship, may be involved—that is, the females more likely to be responsive in marriage are the ones who seek out such experiences before marriage. But after weighing this possibility against his evidence that orgasmic responses can be learned, and that such

learning is most effective in the earlier years, he is inclined to accept the casual relationship.

We have considered the major features of the research method, but there are many incidental aspects which, minor in themselves, can none the less contribute greatly to or detract heavily from the overall significance of such a massive work as this. It appears to us that in many of these aspects Kinsey has evidenced imaginative and careful workmanship. To touch briefly on just two of these, we would mention first the exhaustive study of past researches in the area of sexual behaviour, and the unusual and insightful supplementary sources of evidence which are cited. Even the sexual life of the porcupine and the inscriptions sometimes found on toilet walls have not escaped the rigorous scrutiny of Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues in their unending search for data which will illuminate human sexual behaviour. And secondly, we would comment on the clarity and effectiveness of the charts and tabular presentations. Critics of the first volume often remarked that many of the tables were difficult to interpret, and that there were puzzling and irritating omissions or discrepancies which created difficulty. In the present volume, these defects seem to have been quite completely remedied. Moreover, the convenient tabular summaries of male v. female data at the end of most chapters are immensely helpful to the non-technical reader who might otherwise become lost in detail.

Conclusion

We emphasised at the outset that it is not easy to give a simple answer to such questions as: How good is Kinsey's survey? Does his Report present a true picture of female sexual behaviour? How valid are his conclusions? We hope the reader now realises that Kinsey's Report has a monumental stature in the literature on sexual behaviour, but that like any other investigation, and especially a pioneering investigation in a field which has hitherto been largely impenetrable, it has its limitations and weaknesses. Certainly one cannot, for some of the reasons we have mentioned, accept Kinsey's findings as the definitive answer to problems of sexual behaviour, nor is it necessary to agree with his conclusions in order to recognise the conspicuous contribution which his researches have made

to our understanding in this field. We pay tribute to the care and skill, the thoroughness and the scientific integrity, with which Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues have pursued their inquiries. We hope that their future reports will continue to add so greatly to our understanding of this important area of human activity.

Pull the Sheet and snuff the Candle

A MOST IMPORTANT BOOK, BUT . . .

Ashley Montagu, Ph.D.

ASHLEY MONTAGU, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Rutgers University in New Jersey, is probably best known to the lay reader as the author of the current best-seller, *The Natural Superiority of Women* (Macmillan). And during recent months his personality and his ideas have become familiar to an even bigger audience, for he has achieved success as a lecturer on the history of man on a nationwide educational television programme.

Besides his writings for the layman, which also include *On Being Human*, *On Being Intelligent*, and *Darwin, Competition and Co-operation*, Dr. Montagu has written a number of more specialised scientific books, including *Adolescent Sterility*, *Introduction to Physical Anthropology*, *Coming Into Being Among the Australian Aborigines*, and several others, the latest being *The Meaning of Love*. In addition to his teaching at the university, he lectures at the New School for Social Research and for the Veterans' Administration Postgraduate Training Programme in Psychiatry, and is Director of Research for the New Jersey Committee for Health and Physical Development.

Dr. Montagu is English by birth, has studied in London, Florence and New York, and has also done anthropological field work in the bush countries. He has been married for more than twenty years, and his three children have grown up in a home where there is no mercy for anyone who casts aspersions on women, inadvertently or otherwise.

A MOST IMPORTANT BOOK, BUT . . .

Ashley Montagu

Both the Kinsey Reports on the Male and Female are important books, for Americans at any rate, because they have been and will continue to be responsible for a great deal of discussion concerning subjects which are not too frequently freely and openly discussed. Kinsey supplies the data which may serve as so many whetstones upon which to sharpen our ideas concerning the various aspects of sexual life in which we are involved as individuals and members of society. If only for this reason Kinsey and his co-workers would deserve our gratitude. But the Kinsey workers have put us in their debt for many more reasons than this, and especially because they have thrown so much light upon certain fundamental differences which exist in the sexual nature of female and male. Our society and the persons constituting it will ultimately benefit greatly as a direct result of the publication of these Reports. For the Kinsey Reports are likely to produce greater understanding and wisdom concerning the sexual behaviour of men and women than has hitherto prevailed. This can only do good.

These beliefs of mine do not mean that I consider the Kinsey Reports to be perfect. I do not. Each of the two volumes so far published suffers from certain faults, some of them serious. I have already dealt with the volume on the Male elsewhere (see my essay "Understanding Our Sexual Desires" in *About the Kinsey Report*, edited by Donald Porter Geddes and Enid Curie, Signet Special, New York, 1948, pp. 56-69). In the present contribution I shall restrict my remarks to the volume on the Female.

As a scientist I greatly welcome *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* because the most important finding in that book corroborates my own observations published in my book *The Natural Superiority of Women* (Macmillan, 1853). I refer to the finding by the Kinsey workers that women are far less easily aroused sexually by a whole host of external stimuli than

men, and that they are much less preoccupied with sex than men. Kinsey's statistics explode the myth of female sexuality forever. And if there ever was a perfect example of myth, this is one, for as the Kinsey workers demonstrate, it is utterly false. Of the thirty-three psychosexual stimuli which arouse the male erotically, only three—movies, reading romantic literature, and being bitten—aroused as many as or more females than males. There is, of course, great individual variation, but there can be no doubt about the sex differences as a whole.

The Kinsey workers have reversed the traditional belief, now shown to be false, that women are creatures of sex while men are in control of sex. The opposite is true. Most women have known this for generations, but they don't seem to have had much drive to say so. Simone de Beauvoir in her book, *The Second Sex*, points out that the female is not easily aroused. "Woman's erotic induction is not easy," she writes. "Man is impetuous, woman is only impatient." This is not really good enough. It is typical of much else in this distinguished book. Here the Kinsey facts are very much more impressive than the many pages of Simone de Beauvoir's animadversions on the comparative passiveness of the female.

In all cultures from the very beginning of time women have been at a disadvantage *vis-à-vis* the male. Men are physically stronger, and women are numerically more frequent. At the present time, for example, there are nearly a million and a half more women than men. Where the disproportion between the sexes in status and number is so great, as it has been and still is, the female, in order to cope with the male, has been forced to resort to a large number of devices which would make her sexually attractive—hence, the *seeming* preoccupation of the female with sex. As I have pointed out in my book, *The Natural Superiority of Women*, the behaviour of women in our culture has largely been in response to the behaviour of males toward them. "Men have placed a high premium upon sexual attractiveness; the promised dividends are high, and women, therefore, concentrate on making themselves sexually attractive. But, we repeat, it is the men who are possessed by sex, not the women." By virtue of his statistics, Kinsey will enable men to see the truth and significance of these facts very much more cogently than I could. It may be hoped and expected that the feminine mood will less frequently

be mistaken for disinterest or frigidity than it has been in the past.

Pre-marital Orgasm and Marital Orgasm

The Kinsey workers find that when orgasm is achieved in pre-marital relations it is much more likely to be achieved in marital relations. "Among those" he writes "who had had pre-marital coitus but had failed to reach orgasm in that coitus, between thirty-eight and fifty-six per cent had failed to reach orgasm in the first year of marriage. But among the females who had had pre-marital coitus in which they had reached orgasm at least twenty-five times before marriage, only three per cent had failed to achieve at least some orgasm during the first year of marriage."

On the basis of such findings the Kinsey team feels that a good case is presented for pre-marital sexual relations as a preparation for successful sexual relations in marriage. They are careful not to say so explicitly, but there can be no doubt about the inflection of their words. Our society will have to consider the implications of the Kinsey findings with respect to pre-marital sexual relations very carefully indeed.

There seems good reason to believe that the number of persons indulging in pre-marital sexual relations have been increasing since the end of World War I. Now, as Kinsey revealed in his first volume, he has a tendency to equate frequency with normality, and his whole tendency throughout the present volume on the Female is to urge upon society the necessity of normalising forms of behaviour because they are biologically based and frequent. This may be called the fallacy of "quantified biology," a fallacy from which Kinsey suffers very badly. Surely, the truth is that man is uniquely the creature who is able to master and control his biologically based forms of behaviour. The fact that many persons, in varying degrees, do not succeed in this means neither that it cannot be done, nor that it is undesirable that they should try. I am not arguing for or against pre-marital sexual relations. I am arguing against the validity of a trend of thought which runs riot throughout the two Kinsey Reports. Many of our laws are stupid in prescribing punishments for various forms of

sexual behaviour which are the private concern of those who indulge in them. They need correction. I am sure that they will be corrected, and that Kinsey's work will help to bring about such changes. Our education of the young in the meaning of sex leaves everything to be desired. The psychophysiology of sex is still little understood. But the cause of true knowledge and social health will not be advanced by confusing the issues. And this Kinsey does, I think, when he uses the argument of biology. The result of his biologicistic trend of thought is seen in his interpretation of the significance of pre-marital orgasm for marital orgasm.

He does not overlook the fact that the personalities of the women involved, who indulged in pre-marital intercourse may have been significantly different from those females who did not. He says: "The most responsive females may have been the ones who had had the largest amount of pre-marital experience, and because they were responsive, they were the ones who had most often reached orgasm in marriage." The Kinsey team admits this as a possibility, but they do not think it a sufficient explanation. Maybe not, but I should think it was a very large part of it. Surely, it was not the pre-marital orgasms which were responsible for the successful marital orgasms. Perhaps it was the same factors which were responsible for both. So that even if those ninety-six per cent of women who had orgasms during the first year of marriage had had no pre-marital experience at all, marrying the men they did, they would still, in large proportion, have had orgasms.

Apart from the accounting given of the class and educational status of the 5,940 as a whole, we are not given any information concerning the mental health status of the high-orgasm women. I should think it probable that orgasm is highly correlated with mental health, that the more mentally integrated a woman is the more likely she is to achieve orgasm, that the less mentally integrated she is the more unlikely is she to achieve orgasm. If this could be shown to be true, and on *a fortiori* grounds I believe it will be shown to be true, then quite clearly it is not pre-marital sexual relations that should be encouraged, but the development of mental health in both females and males.

In short, I rather suspect that successful marital sex relations are an expression of the person's successful general

human relations, and not of his or her capacity, biologically based, for quantitative orgasms.

The Pollster Method of Studying Human Beings

Kinsey is by training a taxonomist, a classifier, an arranger of events and phenomena into classes. As a scientist Kinsey's speciality has been the study of insects, and in particular, the gall wasps. Kinsey and his co-workers seem to have brought the methods of the taxonomical entomologist to the study of human beings. Now, it is one thing to attempt to classify human beings as physical organisms, and the attempt is a laudable one even though no anthropologist has thus far succeeded in doing so, but it is quite another to attempt the study of human behaviour by means of taxonomical methods. The creature so prematurely named *Homo sapiens* is a little too complicated for that. It were as if Pope's dictum "The proper study of Mankind is man," had had the contemporary injunction added to it by some learned scholiast—"but, of course, only if the study be conducted in an entomological manner." Indeed, I once had a secretary who typed my illegible script which I intended to read "The proper study of mankind is anthropology," as: "The proper study of mankind is entomology." Whether she was simply exhibiting an unconscious hostility toward the human species, or whether, noble girl, she was merely an unconscious forerunner of Kinsey, I do not know. The taxonomic method simply doesn't work with human beings, largely because we don't yet know enough about them. When we have a great deal more knowledge than we have at present there is no reason why the method shouldn't work as well as it works in any other field. But at best it will always be of limited value when it is the behaviour of human beings that is being considered, simply because human behaviour does not readily lend itself to the blandishments of taxonomic method.

There are quite a number of scientists who believe that by bringing the "dispassionate" methods of their own science, such as physics or chemistry or biology or entomology or what-not, to bear upon the analysis of human behaviour, they are more likely to arrive at sound conclusions than those "second class scientists," as they think of them, who are collectively

lumped together as the "social scientists." The laboratory scientists often believe that human beings are "after all" nothing but complicated machines, and all that one has to do to understand how human beings work is to analyse them precisely by the same means and the same or similar instruments which the laboratory scientist so successfully uses in his own work. In an age of giant robot calculating machines and self-governing mechanisms this view has become increasingly more widespread among scientists. A strong tendency to think this way is inherent in the thinking of a large proportion of scientists—some social scientists among them.

The fallacy such scientists commit when they think this way is known as the "nothing but" fallacy, or "reductionism"—the notion that human beings can be reduced to a kind of mechanical organism, that they are nothing but rather complicated organic machines. No fallacy can be more dangerous than this. The passion to know has in many cases produced a scientific character that is out of balance. The desire to know can, in many cases, become like dipsomania, a "scintomania," in which the victim loses control of himself, and becomes controlled by the intoxicating potations of knowledge to which he has become addicted. I am afraid this has happened to many scientists, with results that are at this stage in the history of humanity almost too frightful to contemplate.

What so many scientists have forgotten is themselves, and this is particularly true of the laboratory scientists. When it comes to the study of human beings, to the study of humanity, it is not anatomy, biochemistry, physics, physiology, or zoology which is important, nor is it the mathematics or statistics or any other laboratory or theoretical method which is important, but it is the humanity of the human being who is the scientist which is important, and all else is secondary to that. The ideal of emotional impersonality which so many scientists deem to be a necessary part of the method of the scientific investigator is not only stultifying, but also ineffectual in the study of human beings. As Dr. David Lindsay Watson has recently put it, in a much needed corrective to the prevailing scientific point of view: "We shall not vitally participate in human situations as they occur unless they impinge effectively on our feelings. Emotion is, then, just as necessary as intellect in studying human nature. Of course, the student may easily be misled by his emotions, but so will he by his lack of emotion."

The road to success in handling human relations does not lie through the inhuman stolidity of the surgeon, but rather—as a first step—through the cultivation of emotional versatility and self-awareness. What is needed is not just participation, but a *critical* participation which holds fast to the thought that "our self-regarding emotions deceive us" (*The Study of Human Nature*, The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1953, p. 109). In short, dispassionate analysis of human behaviour will not suffice alone. The analyst must first and foremost be human. He must be responsive to the human emotions which motivate human beings.

If one asks the question: How does it come about that Kinsey's 5,940 women behave sexually the way they do, the answers offered are at the most superficial and unconvincing of levels. Women behave as they do, Kinsey tells us, because they are forced into a compromise between innate biological drives, social restrictions and pressures, and psychological attitudes instilled by the social mores. I should think that this was a pretty obvious kind of statement, and, as far as it goes it is true enough, but it can hardly be said to go below the surface, for though Kinsey sets out some of the details, the details in so far as the emotional development of his women is concerned scarcely begin to scratch the surface. Kinsey doesn't appear to be very interested in emotions. If he is, he gives little appearance of being so in this volume. The IBM machine doesn't seem to be equipped to handle emotions, and polling the ladies even with 600 questions somehow doesn't seem to yield any answers to the question: What made these women tick sexually the way they do?

Devoutness and Undevoutness in Relation to Sexual Activity

As an example of the manner in which the lack of interest in human emotions affects and coarsens the Kinsey workers' approach to their subject, analysis of the relation of religious devotion to sexual behaviour may be cited as a case in point. Altogether apart from the fact that devout Catholics and orthodox Jews are inadequately represented in the sample, and that, therefore, the sample is heavily weighted with women who are likely to be sexually unconventional, the

have failed to deal with some very important variables with respect to the religious background of their interviewees.

The authors classified their women in three religious groups, devout, moderately religious, and religiously inactive. As might have been expected, they found that "In every one of the eleven groups which are available for comparisons, definitely smaller percentages of the religiously devout females and higher percentages of the religiously less devout or inactive females were experiencing orgasm from any source prior to marriage" (pp. 521-522).

So far, so good. But what I would really want to know, in addition to the religious status of these women when they were interviewed, is what kind of religious training they had received in childhood, how religious they were in childhood, and for what reasons and when did they change their religious status. I believe that the analysis of such data would throw some light upon the sexual behaviour of these women, of a kind which we have not been vouchsafed in the analysis provided by the Kinsey team.

To illustrate what I mean, it is well known that when persons who have been brought up in a religiously very devout home give up their religious beliefs they are likely to give up a great deal along with them. Often they kick over the traces and, in reaction, indulge in highly unconventional behaviour. Upon this theme there are many variations. I should like to know something about them, particularly in relation to sexual behaviour. Neither the data nor the analysis of this interesting problem are to be found in the Kinsey volume. But the Kinsey researchers are not unaware of the problem, for they write: "It has been possible to correlate the sexual data on these histories with the current religious status of each subject, but it has not yet been possible to make correlations with their earlier religious connections. The earlier connections may have been the more significant in affecting the subsequent patterns of sexual behaviour, but we will need a more extensive series than we yet have before we can undertake further analyses" (p. 56).

The indication is that the adequate information was not obtained for many of these women, and hence we shall have to wait until a sufficient number of women have been asked the proper questions. Possibly the Kinsey workers are about to make the momentous discovery that emotions exist.

The Pretentiousness of the Title

The first volume of the Kinsey report was entitled *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*, the second volume is entitled *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*. Actually the first volume is concerned exclusively with the *American* male, and the second volume is concerned exclusively with the *American* female. The fact that neither volume is representative of the American population as a whole is acknowledged at the outset by the Kinsey team. "At its best," they write, "the present volume can pretend to report behaviour which may be typical of no more than a portion, although probably not an inconsiderable portion, of the white females living within the boundaries of the United States. Neither the title of our first volume on the male, nor the title of this volume on the female, should be taken to imply that the authors are unaware of the diversity which exists in patterns of sexual behaviour in other parts of the world" (p. 4).

This is a very necessary explanation, yet it does not eliminate the fact that the books are unsoundly titled. The titles imply either that only Americans are human, or that what is true of Americans is true of all other human beings. A third implication is that no non-American has any sex life. We know that Dr. Kinsey meant to imply none of these things. These books deal with the sexual behaviour of a very limited branch of humanity, namely, the American variety, and a small segment of that variety at that. With some qualifying phrase pointing out that each volume referred to the sexual life of a small and unrepresentative sample of the American population, the books should have been entitled *Sexual Behaviour in the American Male*, and *Sexual Behaviour in the American Female*. It is difficult to understand why these important books, upon which so much care in almost every way has been lavished, were so inappropriately titled.

The title of the book, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*, is doubly misleading since the materials of the work are representative neither of the human female nor of the American female, but of a limited geographic sample of American women, over seventy-five per cent of whom went to college, and nearly twenty per cent of whom had done graduate work!

Since Kinsey is himself not unaware of the dangers of generalisation, it seems to me that he might have taken more care to avoid unjustified generalisations by beginning with the title of his book, by giving it a more accurate title which would properly prepare and orient the reader for the contents. By failing to do so, Kinsey must be held responsible for being the chief contributor to the misleading generalisations which will be made on the basis of what is, after all, the study of the sexual behaviour of a small and selected sample of American women.

Were the readers of Kinsey's book to accept its findings for what they are worth, as a *statistical* accounting of the sexual behaviour of a small sample of *atypical* American women, no great harm would be done. But this is not the manner in which a large number of readers are likely to take Kinsey's findings. That this is so is clear from the many newspaper and magazine articles which began to make their appearance before publication of the book, and which by now constitute a formidable library of the most diverse kinds of reporting and criticism. With very few exceptions these writings generalise Kinsey's findings for American women as a whole.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that from every point of view such generalisation is wholly unjustified. Kinsey's statements about "American women," or those of any other writer repeating or misrepeating Kinsey, are not true of American women as a whole, because Kinsey's sample is *not* representative of American women as a whole, but as he himself says, of only a small segment.

The Positive Contributions

In spite of statistical and methodological inadequacies, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* is, in my considered judgment, one of the most important books on sexual behaviour in woman ever written. It would be so if it had only made clear, as the Kinsey researchers have, that females and males develop sexually at different rates and according to different patterns; that the male reaches his peak in his early teens and thereafter steadily declines, whereas the female matures sexually much more slowly, and doesn't get to where the boy is in his early teens till her late teens or early twenties, and that while the

male's sexual energies become increasingly dampened, the female maintains hers upon a more or less level plateau into the fifties or even sixties. Thus, in the earlier years the males generally want more coitus than their wives are ready to grant, while in the latter years the females are ready for more coitus than the males are able to supply!

The authors are almost certainly right in suggesting that much marital unhappiness is brought about as a result of these misunderstandings which arise from the unrecognised disparities in the development of the sexes.

Contrary to prevailing popular ideas, the Kinsey workers have found that women of the higher educational levels are, significantly, sexually more responsive, as measured by frequency of orgasm, than those of the lower educational levels. This finding is contrary to an earlier, unpublished calculation made by the authors. It would have been interesting to learn whether there were any differences among the women who were educated in colleges for women as compared with co-educational institutions. I am willing to wager that the co-educational girls did better than those who were educated in women's colleges.

That females are far less given to sexual perversities of every kind is another important finding. Homosexual contacts, for example, are much less frequent and there is much less promiscuity among females than among males. As the Kinsey workers point out, the widespread belief of the public at large and also of many clinicians that homosexual attachments occur more frequently among females than among males, is very substantially demolished by their findings.

The correction of the many absurdities which circulate as knowledge concerning the dangers of pre-marital petting, masturbation, *und so weiter*, frequently reinforced by the *obiter dicta* of library scholars, constitutes yet another of the great services performed by the authors in the cause of clearer and healthier thinking and action.

The important discussions of the legal aspects of the various forms of sexual behaviour will be of great service to those whose thinking needs to be clarified on this subject, as well as to those who may be legally interested. These discussions are eminently sound, far-reaching, and humane, and cause us to look forward with great interest to the volume or volumes which the authors will devote to this subject.

Above and beyond all, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* brings a much needed wholesomeness to a subject over which, as Dean Swift said, men generally pull the sheet and snuff the candle. The Kinsey workers thus continue in the tradition they set with the first volume. Humanity is greatly in their debt.

Let's talk about sex

IMPLICATIONS FOR MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL ADJUSTMENT

Emily Mudd, Ph.D.

EMILY HARTSHORNE MUDD, who took an active part in the Kinsey studies as one of the five consulting editors for the Report on Women, is one of the country's outstanding marriage counsellors. She is director of the Marriage Council of Philadelphia, an assistant professor in the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, and President of the American Association of Marriage Counsellors.

Dr. Mudd is married to Dr. Stuart Mudd, the eminent microbiologist, one of whose discoveries led to the development of blood plasma, and they have four children. It was after her marriage, when she became active as a part-time worker in agencies like the YWCA, maternal health centres, parents' councils, etc., that Emily Mudd began her career in the social work field. Then she got together with community leaders in Philadelphia who were interested in forming a marriage counselling service. Later it turned out that, as an outstanding wife and mother, Dr. Mudd was chosen for the job of director, instead of a professional social worker. She returned to college as she approached middle age, and didn't actually become Dr. Mudd until recently, when she got her doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania. Today she works full time, running the marriage council, lecturing, and teaching at the University.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL ADJUSTMENT

Emily Mudd

The Kinsey Reports have afforded the basis for two lecture discussions in the course on Family Attitudes and Sexual Behaviour, a Senior elective offered by the Department of Psychiatry in the School of Medicine of the University of Pennsylvania. After the first of these lectures the question was raised by a student—"given government backing and all the money you can spend . . . how would you go about creating the new 'healthier' attitude toward sex education and sexual behaviour which has been advocated by certain thoughtful professional persons, on the basis of their interpretation of Kinsey's findings concerning the positive correlation between former sexual experience and sex adjustment later in marriage?" In the next week's lecture I attempted to comment on this question along the following lines.

This question, calling for a plan of social action, implies that the objectives of action looking toward social change are already clearly defined. Such, of course, is not the case. However, there are at least four, and maybe more paths we could follow in seeking to clarify our thinking in this area. First of all, we certainly have the obligation to explore available knowledge, and the Kinsey Reports come in this category, as one very significant contribution to available information on the subject of sexual activities. Secondly, we are obligated to explore the customs, mores, regulations and laws governing ways of living, as these relate to the subjects we have in mind. Thirdly, we are bound to explore behaviours, both abnormal and hopefully normal. And if we are going to do any of these three things, we can't avoid the fourth—the exploration of attitudes, feelings, points of view—those of the human beings that we work with, and those of the "experts."

Before proceeding, I would like to point out briefly some of the natural limitations, as well as the assets of the Kinsey material. I mention "natural limitations" because Dr. Kinsey

did not plan or attempt to study many of the facets of sexual behaviour and its social and emotional implications which he is criticised for omitting. It would be difficult for anyone to question that the Kinsey Reports present us with important facts which indicate that we can make certain broad generalisations about the samples of men and women studied—(1) that the large majority of the people interviewed have active sexual lives: (2) that they illustrate great individual range and variation in their sexual activity. There is, however, little information given in the Report as to whether the sexual activity presented, studied and put into tables and averages was related to either happy or unhappy, to constructive or destructive ways of living. There is little discussion of whether the achievement of orgasmic response was related to satisfaction in personal or interpersonal relations. This, of course, as already mentioned, was not the purpose of this particular report, but may presumably be part of a later volume planned to deal with sexual adjustment in marriage.

So to return to the student's question concerning the creation of a new "healthier" attitude, it seems to me to be premature to attempt to interpret or apply the findings of this report on women's sexual behaviour to groups or to individuals in general for the purpose of recommending specific and definite revisions of either our mores, of our value systems, or of our individual behaviour. How can we know as yet exactly what will constitute "healthier" behaviour for women in general? To insure "healthy" results for the individual, we know that her own individual feelings, needs, and aspirations have to be satisfactorily co-ordinated with her environmental pressures.

The following reasons are among those which influence me to believe that efforts to advise or recommend immediate changes in attitudes and procedures are premature. In spite of the tremendous and excellent contribution which Dr. Kinsey has given us, which is far greater in its efforts and its results than any other study that has been made in this field, Dr. Kinsey's samples are admittedly and inevitably selective to some extent. They have more than the average number of college educated people; they have comparatively few persons from certain religious sub-groups; and they must represent those persons who are willing to give histories. In spite of their

size, and they represent a larger group than any other research on sex, they obviously cannot include all men or women in the population. And as I have already mentioned, Dr. Kinsey himself admittedly does not attempt to correlate his reports of sexual activity with other aspects of living in the subjects he studied. Although Dr. Kinsey presents ranges of individual variation, his findings also give averages based on the group of subjects who gave individual histories. It is terribly easy for the reader to jump in and take something which Dr. Kinsey has discussed as an average, and try to apply it to a specific individual's behaviour. There is no validity in this, it often makes for misunderstandings which have dangerously upsetting implications. Kinsey himself reiterates over and over again that he is talking about averages, and not individuals.

Dr. Kinsey's focus on the measurement of one physiological phenomenon of sexual activity—orgastic response—has, however, given much important and valuable information on an aspect of sex that was not available before. But another factor enters into any attempts to interpret and apply these findings to our current behaviour. The two reports deal little with, or add little to our knowledge of "this thing called love"—the feelings, motivations, values, ideals and goals which are involved in loving or in being loved, and their relation to orgastic capacity and other aspects of sexual activity. Neither does this report deal with the directly opposite feelings—those of hate, and their effect on orgasm and sexual activity. Dr. Karl Menninger, in his review of the Kinsey Report in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, deals rather extensively with some of these ideas. But this does not, to my way of thinking, imply that Dr. Kinsey either denies or is not interested in love or hate, or the vital importance of the feelings which these, or other intense emotions produce in adjustment to living. He does not claim to have attempted a comprehensive study on emotions and adjustment. But his studies furnish specific factual information which future research may correlate with findings on emotion and adjustment.

The Kinsey Report is the first comprehensive, detailed study of many specific types and forms of sexual activity in the female. In our culture it is more difficult to think comfortably of the female as a sexually active human being than the male. Because of this, and because of the unprecedented publicity

and the unrestricted sale of these Reports the impact of the information which they distribute to the population at large has been tremendous. There has been no gradual dissemination of facts or ideas, comparable to that which occurs when a new discovery is reported in the medical literature and then, later, by popular journals, the Press, radio, or television. There is a kind of shock effect to the releasing of this Report to the population *in toto*, which has a traumatic aspect, I believe, and which certainly has drawn traumatic responses and stirred up many emotions. Anyone who hears these Reports, talks with their friends about them, and sees them in the different popular magazines, can't help but wonder where they as an individual fit into this or that pattern. We wonder about our friends and our associates. We wonder if our sexual activities have been too limited, or possibly too excessive.

Our loyalties to our existing mores—the religions, the social philosophies, the daily behaviour to which we are accustomed—are activated and re-activated in response to these Reports, and quite understandably so. The phenomenon of the emotional response of people in general to these Reports, and especially to the recent Report on Women, is not unsimilar in certain respects to the announcement of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Moral and ethical values are highlighted, and conflicting reactions are inevitable. But I believe that, in heading into this whole situation, time is of utmost importance, and probably will be one of our greatest allies. Time is needed for the assimilation of this material and the thoughts and feelings it invokes. Much more time is needed to bring it into our consciousness. At first much of our subconscious is stirred and churned, and perhaps forced into an unknown recognition. It is only after some assimilation has occurred that we can expect our feelings, and later on, our behaviour, to reflect a considered part of ourselves. There is always a lag between behaviour, changing mores and reform of laws. This is the “cultural lag” that the sociologists talk about so much.

But to return to our original question—“If we had funds available to do something about this Report, what might we consider doing?” My first suggestion would be to encourage every kind of group to meet and talk together, and in the process of talking together, to acquaint themselves with the facts of what they are talking about, and not to depend on

surmise and rumour. People must actually look into the Report seriously before giving themselves the luxury of criticising, taking exception, commenting, and making broad generalisations about it. Another thing we must do is to use more professional workers as discussion leaders for such groups, so that interested laymen will have direction and guidance from someone who has at least some idea of group dynamics, some degree of objectivity, who is familiar with the facts in the material, and who is also without missionary implications in his relationship to the group. And then these groups might raise the questions—"What is a healthier attitude? . . . What is healthy behaviour?" Such discussions should enhance the realisation of the complexity of this whole situation, and the difficulties of jumping at any sudden conclusions concerning "healthier" attitudes or "healthier" sexual behaviour, no matter how dramatic the indications for these conclusions may seem to be.

In my work with people who seek marriage counselling, I find daily illustrations which seem both to corroborate and to take exception to the averages which Kinsey discusses. I could mention a case of a young couple who had a warm, sharing relationship when they were engaged, but both felt convinced that they wanted to wait for their complete sexual relationship until after they were married. In this particular case, the girl said that she had not had orgasmic experience through masturbation, or any other form of the now famous outlets, during her growing-up period, her engagement, and even until her marriage. And yet she and her husband, we learned in our follow-up contact with them, were able to work out a mutually participating and highly satisfying relationship, including full orgasmic response for both, within a few months after their wedding.

I can mention a couple who had sexual relationships before marriage which were extremely satisfying to both of them, but immediately following the marriage, the girl became unable to achieve orgasm at all within the marriage relationship. And in my clinical experience that is not a completely unusual situation, and there are many factors that may contribute to it.

There was another case where the girl in the marriage had one pre-marital experience, during the war, with a man she expected to marry. She spent the week-end with him in a hotel before he sailed. But it happened that this man subsequently fell in love with another girl, and the engagement was broken. Later on, the girl became engaged to another man, and felt that she wanted to share with him the fact that she had been involved in this former experience, and under what circumstances. When she told him, he said that he understood and forgave her, though he did not approve, either for himself or for her, of similar experiences during their pre-marital period. But after this couple had been married for a year, the man spent an increasing amount of time quizzing his wife on every detail of her week-end with her former fiancée. She began by answering his questions as patiently, honestly and clearly as she could, but the more she answered, the more he asked, until it became a really compulsive kind of situation. Finally the sexual relationship which this couple had established became upset; the man withdrew entirely from continuing sexual relation, saying that, because of this one experience, his wife was not a suitable person to be the mother of his children.

I could pick almost any number of illustrations like these which, individually, would seem to prove one point or disprove another. But the results, I believe, always have to do with the feelings, attitude, and environmental circumstances under which the particular kind of behaviour was undertaken, and the feelings and the attitudes of the people involved, rather than with the fact that there were pre-marital relations, or no pre-marital relations.

On the basis of the kind of work that I have done over the years as a marriage counsellor, it is my belief that what makes one person comfortable and happy may do just the opposite for another person. It seems to me that it depends on how and where these persons live, how they were brought up, what their ideals and goals and expectations are, and how great their need is to put these goals, ideals and expectations into effect. Personally, I do not believe that any hard and fast recommendation of what is a "healthy attitude" or "healthier" behaviour can or should be super-imposed on any individual against his own judgment and inclinations. But

you can help people to explore what is sound and real and constructive for them, and those to whom they are related, within the reality of their own community. People can't live in a vacuum.

In conclusion, I would like to stress the fact that all the figures in the Kinsey Report on Women as well as the Kinsey Report on Men are for the average. They may not be applicable to any individual man or woman. One thing that seems to be clear from this book is that women vary far more than men in their sexual needs. Some women seem to have literally no sexual needs, which is hardly true for any man. On the other hand, a few women have far more sexual needs than the most highly sexed man. But the great majority of women who fall between these two extremes are pretty much like the great majority of men, from a good many sexual angles. And this is a pretty important discovery to have made. It must be remembered that any statistic represents the average of all women who gave histories, and does not represent any particular individual. Dr. Kinsey himself emphasizes that the sexual history of each individual represents a unique combination of all the variables involved. He states, "We have never found a female who was a composite of all the averages on all the aspects of sexual response." Women are, in fact, remarkably like men in their sexual drive—more like them than we have thought, particularly in the type and intensity of the sexual response.

The important thing, I believe, is that although American women emerge from all those pages of careful analysis with far more sexual drive than they have ever been given credit for, they also emerge, as Hannah Lees says in an article on the Kinsey Report in *Argosy*, "warmer, wiser, and more healthfully suited to a happy life with American men than most of our fathers or mothers ever wanted us to believe."

Portrayers of human weakness
“I AM CONCERNED . . .”

Millicent C. McIntosh, Ph.D.

MILlicent CAREY McINTOSH, president of Barnard College, Columbia University, is a leader in the field of women's education. At Barnard, Mrs. McIntosh has been most interested in bridging the gap between learning and living, which she feels to be the chief responsibility of a college education, and in helping to remove the obstacles in the way of college-educated women who wish to combine motherhood with a career.

Mrs. McIntosh herself is a unique example of a remarkable combination of marriage and a career, for in private life she is the wife of Dr. Rustin McIntosh, Carpentier Professor of Diseases of Children at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, and Director of Pediatrics at Presbyterian Hospital. They have been married for thirty-two years and have a daughter and four sons; their eldest sons, who are twins, are now at Harvard.

Mrs. McIntosh went to Barnard as Dean in 1947 from the Brearley School in New York City, where she was headmistress for seventeen years. Born in Baltimore, one of six children of a Quaker family, she took her doctorate in English at Johns Hopkins, taught English at Bryn Mawr, and was also acting Dean of that college. She has been honoured with a number of honorary degrees and other awards. In 1948 she was awarded the Roosevelt Medal for leadership of youth and development of character, and in 1949, the Hundred Year Association Medal for “outstanding achievement in the interests of the City of New York, particularly in the field of education.”

“I AM CONCERNED . . .”

Millicent C. McIntosh

I am concerned about the effect of the Kinsey Reports on young men and women of high school and college age. The Report on Women only supplements and intensifies the effect of the Report on Men, since as has been flippantly suggested, the description of heterosexual activity in the 1948 book gave us much of the information about women which is detailed in the last book.

I am concerned about the wide and unfortunate publicity given to the Reports. The result of this publicity is that garbled or incomplete information culled from the books has been available on every news stand to young people of any age. The material of these Reports is obviously not suitable for the kind of publicity they have received. The purpose of the writers, and of the Foundations who supported the studies, was highly specialised and scientific, and one can respect the motives which prompted the study. The results have sociological, clinical, and legal implications; but no one in his wildest dreams would say that they provided constructive reading for the boy or girl of sixteen.

Even the general adult is hardly equipped to interpret the material as it has been presented. As Lionel Trilling pointed out in his essay on the first Report, the American people approach the findings of scientists with complete faith that they must be true. Having accepted them as true, they attribute to them a validity which endues them with moral sanctions. The radio-commercial technique provides another way of over-impressing Americans. If you make a statement often enough, people begin to believe it, no matter how much they may realise in their more lucid moments that they should not swallow it whole.

The Kinsey Report uses all the techniques to which Americans are especially vulnerable. Its pages and pages of statistics, while dull and very depressing, are equally impressive to the ordinary person. The interview technique has a sinister

kind of fascination, especially for women, most of whom like to talk about themselves and their own experiences, and especially about their troubles. The way in which the Report on Women was presented to the public insured its distribution to all females who can read. The space given it by the reputable Press was less significant in this regard than the prominence it attained in widely read magazines. The women's editors especially did their "duty" to a man (or woman); they editorialised and commented so fully that a girl would be stupid indeed who did not absorb the gist of the Report in one session at the hairdresser's.

This result must be what Dr. Kinsey and his associates wished to achieve. But it has brought about a situation which gives me my second great concern. I am certain that Dr. Kinsey's books contribute materially to the difficulties encountered by young people in establishing good relations between the sexes. All boys and girls are pathetically anxious to be "normal." Any characteristic which sets them apart from others of their age or social group is a source of anxiety. They are especially vulnerable in the whole area of boy-girl relationships. Whatever is done by the crowd is what they must do, lest they risk being peculiar, bluestocking, prudish, with the inevitable resulting unpopularity. So, if the Kinsey Report announces that ninety-one per cent of females have done petting by age twenty-five, and eighty-one per cent by age eighteen, the girl who is being pressed by a boy to go further than she thinks proper feels herself trapped by these statistics. If she is not erotically abused, or does not wish to be, she begins to wonder if she is normal. A counsellor in a university recently stated that many boys he knew felt that they were not actually virile if they could not keep up with the statistics Dr. Kinsey presents of sex experience for males of their age group.

Moreover, although Dr. Kinsey does not pretend to take moral positions, and at intervals through the Report disclaims any authoritarian position, the evidence as he presents it makes claims for a completely new moral code. So, he clearly believes himself that women who have had pre-marital experience of orgasm, either through petting or through coitus, have a markedly improved chance of success in marriage. One has to read carefully among his many illustrations and statements that contribute to this idea to find his warnings against taking his discoveries as final.

If the Kinsey studies had been printed privately and made available to professionals only, their usefulness would not have been diminished. As the situation is now, I believe that their wide distribution has added greatly to the confusion in the moral climate of our time. Human beings have been long enough in emerging from their animal natures and in attaining values which are above and beyond those associated with physical sensation and pleasure. Dr. Kinsey seems to find complete justification for our ignoring these higher values in the fact that the lower mammals have no knowledge of them. He is perfectly content with the behaviour of his fantastic collection of females because this behaviour (1) occurs very often among the 5,000-odd specimens he has collected; and (2) because it is similar to that found in animals.

He is not the only person who presents a picture of confused and promiscuous behaviour. A half-dozen plays on Broadway and many more movies are always available to express the tortured struggles of young people. "The Voice of the Turtle," in which a handsome girl and two attractive boys leap in and out of bed on the stage in different combinations, runs for several years, with wide acclaim from everyone. "Tea and Sympathy," in which the wife of the housemaster solves the troubled boy's problem by taking him to sleep with her, is accepted as the highest form of art and humanity.

In this welter of confusion, many authors seize the opportunity to analyse the misfortune of being a woman. Ferdinand Lundberg and Maryoria Farnham's *Modern Women, the Lost Sex*, is succeeded by Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, which presents with unforgettable vividness the exploitation of the woman in sex relationship. And now Dr. Kinsey comes along, setting woman in his animalistic world, lining up statistics which seem to show that she is not really different from the bitch or the cow or the female goat.

Well—my answer to these portrayers of human weakness is that men and women may be able to profit by the sufferings and mistakes of the human race, but they need not be bound by them. Young women can learn not to be ashamed of their bodies and of their physical drives; if Dr. Kinsey has a human contribution to make this is surely part of it. But they cannot afford to forget that sex is only a part of love; that they can know the depth and richness of a full sex relationship only when it is part of a total human experience. No sex

act which violates one's sense of what is right and good, or which upsets the standards of another person is justified, no matter how many times it may appear on Dr. Kinsey's tables. And no young man who presses a girl to commit such an act is worth holding on to.

It seems a pity that work which is undertaken with such enormous industry and in such expensive detail should be devoid of life and warmth and feeling—in short, devoid of immediate human significance. It seems an even greater pity that through misguided enthusiasm or economic considerations, these books have been considered proper material for common consumption and have become best-sellers. It behoves those of us who have wide confidence in the young people of today, and who have many opportunities for contacts with them, to meet squarely the issues presented by the book, and to discuss them fully, whenever the possibility presents itself. In this way, perhaps, the facts presented by Dr. Kinsey and his associates may lead us to a deeper understanding of our human problems.

Healing the human sore

DR. KINSEY'S SUMMUM BONUM

Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, A.B.

DOROTHY DUNBAR BROMLEY, a leading journalist and radio commentator, is noted for her writings on problems connected with sex, maternity, marriage and divorce. With Florence Haxton Britten she was co-author of one of the first important books which systematically analyzed and gathered data on sexual behaviour—*Youth and Sex* (Harper and Brothers, 1938), a questionnaire and interview study of 1,300 male and female college students. Another book by Mrs. Bromley, *Birth Control, Its Use and Misuse* (Harper and Brothers, 1935), which included an introduction by Dr. Robert L. Dickinson, America's foremost pioneer in sexual matters, was read widely in the United States and England, and was translated into Spanish for South America. She has also written numerous articles on marriage and divorce, from the legal, religious and social viewpoints, which have appeared in England, France and the Scandinavian countries as well as in the United States.

Mrs. Bromley began her career in book publishing, and her first magazine article, exposing the high maternal mortality rate at the time, appeared in *Harper's Magazine* in 1927. Since then she has published frequently in *Harper's*, the women's magazines and other journals, has written daily columns for the *New York World-Telegram* and the *New York Post*, and has been a feature writer, and editor of a Sunday page, for the *New York Herald Tribune*. Since 1952, she has been conducting a weekly half-hour programme on a wide variety of social and political subjects for radio station WMCA.

DR. KINSEY'S SUMMUM BONUM

Dorothy Dunbar Bromley

"Thus anciently is mutual love ingrained in mankind, resembling our early estate and endeavouring to combine two in one and heal the human sore . . ." Aristophanes, in Plato's *Symposium*.

It was a meaningful conceit that Plato wove of the globular, two-faced, bi-sexual creature born of the moon, who was sliced in two by Zeus and ever after sought to be grafted together again. The grafting together—"the healing of the human sore"—has never been perfect, although it may momentarily seem so to a man and woman locked in coitus and confident, as too few are, of mutual love.

Western man has traditionally believed in a whole complex of differences that distinguish men's sexual responses and attitudes from women's. Now Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues, in a work of unprecedented magnitude, have attempted to identify the verifiable differences. They have come up with some important data, but unfortunately they have left more than a few questions unanswered and have made some mistaken assumptions, so fearful have they been of exploring emotions, as distinct from kinetic responses. It is just possible that Dr. Kinsey's new volume, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*, might be more complete than it is if the male team of investigators and writers had had more than one woman among their five consulting editors.

This is not to say that I haven't the greatest admiration for Kinsey and company's interviewing skill. Their success in obtaining 5,490 complete interviews with women testifies to their sympathetic and yet objective approach. For a male scientist, even in this day and age, to address organisations of women—in some cases, church groups—and to persuade some, if not all of their individual members, to report for interviews on their sexual histories, is no slight achievement. It has been charged, I know, that only those women who had

a very lively interest in sex responded to Dr. Kinsey's invitation. But with all the deficiencies in the sample, I still would make this guess about it, judging from what I know of city-dwelling women and from what I learned at first hand in making a college study seventeen years ago*: I believe that Dr. Kinsey does give us a representative sample of urban American women sixteen to forty years of age of the social class that attends college. I should say that this bracket of American women, within the limits of the questions put to them and in so far as their memories did not play them false, gave the interviewer a true, if completely externalised, account of their sex lives.

Within the limits of the inquiry attempted, this painstakingly prepared study is a compendium of data, some of it previously known in general terms, much of it of sociological value. We're told, for instance, that the median frequency of coitus among married women is 2.8 times per week for the sixteen-to twenty-year-olds and 1.5 times per week for the thirty-six-to forty-year-olds. What is interesting is that the young-married, while they engaged in coitus more frequently, less often attained orgasm. In the first year of marriage only sixty-three per cent of the wives reached orgasm, while after twenty years eight-five to ninety per cent were attaining it. These figures suggest that frigidity, at least among educated urban American women, is not at all prevalent. We've put well behind us, thanks to Freud's indirect influence, the concept that a virtuous, decent woman could remain passive in coitus.

But does a woman's active participation in coitus to the point of orgasm in itself spell a happy sexual life? Dr. Kinsey tells us nothing of the emotional, as distinct from the momentary, physiological satisfaction that the wives in his sample derive from marital coitus and nothing of their motivation; nor does he tell us anything of what at times inhibits them—what prevents their engaging in coitus or leads them to hold back from orgasm.

Emotional factors, granted, are hard to measure—much harder than incidence of coitus and orgasm. "It would have been impossible, in any large-scale survey," Dr. Kinsey says (p. 510) "to have secured as precise records on some of the

* Bromley, D. D. and Britten, F. H. 1938. *Youth and Sex*. A study of 1,300 College Students. New York and London. Harper and Brothers.

other, less certainly identifiable aspects of sexual behaviour." Certainly it would not have been an easy task, but it does seem to me that questions could have been phrased to elicit answers which would have thrown light on the emotional content of each reported sexual relationship. Since no such questions were asked of the men and women on whom he has reported in his two published volumes, one is constrained to conclude that Dr. Kinsey is not greatly interested in this aspect of a human being's sex life, and that he is more interested, to judge from his stress, on the orgasm *per se*.

He does seek to save himself from so severe an indictment—made by a number of critics of his first book, by saying: (p. 511)

"It is, of course, true that sexual experience may have a significance which lies beyond the physiologic release that it provides, and each type of sexual experience may have its own peculiar significance. For instance, many persons will consider the psychologic significance of an orgasm attained in masturbation very different from the psychologic significance of an orgasm derived from a socio-sexual source. The social significance of orgasms attained in non-marital coitus may be different from those attained in marital coitus. In many ways, it may be more significant to know the frequencies and incidences of the particular types of sexual activity (Chapters 5-12) than it is to total them. . . ."

He also enters this disclaimer: (p. 371)

"Although we may use orgasm as a measure of the frequency of female activity, and may emphasise the significance of orgasm as a source of physiological outlet and of social interchange for the female, it must always be understood that we are well aware that this is not the only significant part of a satisfactory sexual relationship. This is more true for the female than it would be for the male. . . ."

Since Dr. Kinsey grants that for women, even more than for men, the orgasm is not the only significant part of a satisfactory sexual relationship, why did he not investigate the other "significant factors?" His answer that he could not get "precise records" leaves me dissatisfied. For the title of both books promises a more all-encompassing survey.

In his first book he overlooked at least some men's psychic capacity in sexual response, just as he now neglects to study women's. We are all aware that there are sensitive, imaginative

men who find far greater happiness in sexual union with a woman whom they truly love than with the most skilled courtesan or whore. How many such men, one would like to know, are there? Dr. Kinsey made no effort to find out.

There is more to be learned about the sexual nature of man, it seems to me, in James Jones' remarkable novel, *From Here to Eternity**, than in Dr. Kinsey's first volume. Jones shows us that it is not only cultivated men who yearn for that "something plus" in a sexual relationship. His hero Prew, the enlisted soldier from the West Virginia hill country who is a poet when he plays the bugle, says to himself as he prepares for an expedition to town:

"You won't find the thing you want, not in any whorehouse, you talk about a piece of ass so glibly, as if it held the answer . . ."

There are orgasms—and orgasms—as Dr. Karl Menninger, the psychiatrist, pointed out in his review of Dr. Kinsey's volume on women. An orgasm may be solely a physical experience, or a deeply emotional one.

But this is mere mystification, Dr. Kinsey would retort. In his chapter on "Psychologic Factors in Sexual Response," he has this to say on the first page:

"It is important to understand how nebulous the distinctions are between the psychologic and physiologic aspects of behaviour, for there are some who seem to believe that there are three universes: an animal's anatomy, its physiology, and its psychology . . .

"Such specious distinctions between form and function have, unfortunately, lent encouragement to the opinion that the psychologic aspects of human sexual behaviour are of a different order from, and perhaps more significant than, the anatomy or physiology of sexual response and orgasm. Such thinking easily becomes mystical, and quickly identifies any consideration of anatomic form and physiologic function as a scientific materialism which misses the 'basic,' the 'human,' and the 'real' problems in behaviour. This, however, seems an unnecessary judgment . . . These aspects of behaviour which we identify as psychologic can be nothing but certain aspects of that same basic anatomy and physiology."

* The passages from the novel *From Here To Eternity* by James Jones are reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

So this chapter, so promisingly and ambitiously captioned, turns into nothing more than a discussion of the psychosexual (read sensory) stimuli that excite men, as distinct from women, to a desire for coitus. In this frame the chapter has its educational value. A much smaller number of women than men are reported to be stimulated sexually by erotic photographs, by sights, sounds or smells that recall a previous sexual experience, or by observing other individuals engaged in sexual activities.

On this score the Kinsey data check with the novelist's perception. Waiting in the company day-room to join a buddy who will make with him that longed-for and yet not longed-for trip to town, Prew thumbs through a stack of magazines:

"... the first thing in the *Post* (the *Saturday Evening Post*) he saw was another ad, a dull-page Greyhound Bus Lines spread telling about the Glory of the Southern Sun, and in the middle a full-length figure of a woman, the round lean lines of her hips staring at you from behind the tiny loosely skirted pants of the two-piece bathing suit.

"'All right,' he thought, 'okay; if that's the way it is'; savagery of anger in him now at the pictures. 'They call them 'pin-up' girls and think its cute how 'our boys,' now that they're drafted, love to hang them in their wall lockers. And then close up all the whorehouses, every place they can, so our young men will not be contaminated.'"

How different man from woman! I can't imagine a woman, although Dr. Kinsey did find some, who could be excited sexually by a picture of an unknown male, nude or partly nude. Recently I read with fascinated wonder the news story about the State Department officer who was separated from the service as a security risk (sic) because he made a hobby of collecting photographs of women nude above the waist.

Unlike numbers of men, we women do not easily transfer our desire for one particular member of the opposite sex to another who is more accessible. In Jones' novel a second enlisted man, Leva, after seeing the Captain's wife pass by, says to himself:

"Goddam her. Her and them sweaters . . . every time she comes in here it costs me three bucks with Mrs. Kipfer at the New Congress and a buck roundtrip taxifare to town. . . ."

Two Exceedingly Interesting Chapters.

That a man should be aroused by the sight of female pulchritude and suffer bodily discomfort if no release is at hand, should not be charged against his morals. Dr. Kinsey's finding that various sensory stimuli precipitate sexual arousal in a large percentage of men, should give pause to the professional moralists and the piously accusatory women.

Married women—all women—should realise, to quote Dr. Kinsey, that "the average male has a greater need than most females for regular and frequent sexual outlet" (p. 684).

But it does not follow, he says, that women's physiologic capacity to respond in coitus is any different from men's. In two exceedingly interesting chapters on the anatomy and physiology of sexual response and orgasm, he shows that the male and female responses are practically identical, basing this conclusion on studies of both infra-human mammals and humans in coitus. Blood pressure, pulse, respiration, bodily movements and even brain waves are taken into account in these two chapters that seem to me to make a greater contribution to science than any others in the book.

Since women are capable of the same physiologic response in orgasm as men, why do they not have the same need for a regular and frequent sexual outlet? Dr. Kinsey does not have the answer, but he speculates on the possibility that the difference in their responses may have hormonal or neutral bases—a field of research still to be explored.

In the meantime the generalisation can be made safely, I think, that men are more often concerned, sometimes consumed, with thoughts of overt sexual activity, women with thoughts of love. Significantly, the seeing of motion pictures was the only "psychosexual stimulus" which aroused more women erotically than men. Commenting, Dr. Kinsey says simply that "some of the stimulation provided by a motion picture may depend on the romantic action which it portrays, and some of it may depend on the portrayal of some particular person. . . ."

There's more to be said, I think, by way of comment on the statistic that forty-eight per cent of the women in the Kinsey sample (and remember they are for the most part presumably sophisticated urban women of the educated class) found motion

pictures to some degree erotically stimulating, as compared with only thirty-six per cent of the males. The explanation may be found in women's overriding need to feel that they are loved. Because many are starved for tenderness, whether or not they are married and having coitus, a large number identify themselves with the silver-screen heroine, and fall in love vicariously with the male hero who withholds from the heroine neither tenderness nor a complete emotional commitment.

How many of these considerations, one wonders, will be brought out in the book on the sexual aspects of marriage which Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues intend to write in the future? And how well-qualified is he to write a definitive study in this area, convinced as he is that a human being's feelings, emotions and thoughts about a sexual partner are "nothing but certain aspects of . . . anatomy and physiology?" It could be that Dr. Kinsey spent too many years studying the gall wasp.

The Indiana University scientist has still to tell us whether more women than men are dissatisfied with their marriages and indifferent to coitus because love—a word which I find hurriedly used in but two places in the present book—has fled, or never existed. Also he has still to tell us how many women transfer their emotional preoccupation with their husbands to their children. In the present volume he does not even indicate how many of the married women in his sample have children.

When he comes to the menopause and its effect on a woman's libido, his data are scant. His sample of 173 women who had gone through natural menopause is too small to justify his conclusion that diminishing oestrogen secreted by the ovaries does not reduce sexual response or activities. Also, his analysis of his data appears faulty. Of the 174 women, forty-six are reported not to have experienced orgasm for a year or two "before menopause"—so that there was no change, he says, in their failure to respond sexually. But at what point was menopause considered to have set in? Only with the complete cessation of menstruation? It seems likely that the slowing down of ovarian activity has both a physiological and emotional impact on numbers of women long before this point in time. Actually, in the group of 174, only sixty-six women reported that their sexual responses had continued at the same level or higher—as was the case with sixteen women. By concluding, on such thin evidence, that the menopause does not

affect sexual response in most women, Dr. Kinsey shows once again, it seems to me, his over-eagerness to report unflagging sexual activity.

Orgasm, preferably through coitus, so that it has the value of "social interchange," appears to be a *summum bonum* to Dr. Kinsey. If this were not so, he would hardly go as far as he does in advising, in effect, all young women to have pre-marital relations.

"Well over half," he writes (p. 329), "of the females who had had pre-marital coital experience which had led to orgasm, had reached orgasm in practically all of their coitus during the first year of marriage. Of those who had had no pre-marital coital experience and had not reached orgasm from any source (as in masturbation), before marriage, only twenty-nine per cent had approached a 100 per cent response in the first year of marriage."

The common-sense deduction to be drawn is that the more natively responsive females had pre-marital experience because they were responsive, and that they more easily attained orgasm, whether in pre-marital or marital coitus, for that very reason. Dr. Kinsey admits that this selective factor could have been at work, but then he points out that some women, unresponsive in the early years of marriage, develop a capacity to reach orgasm in the course of years of marriage. Ergo, he would seem to say, attaining orgasm is a learning process for most women. But in another chapter he tells us that engaging in coitus and reaching orgasm are activities that human beings do not have to learn any more than other mammals do.

It must be conceded, of course, that an excessively puritanical upbringing can counteract or suppress the natural female impulse. Dr. Kinsey is quite right when he says (p. 172) that "the girl who has spent her pre-marital years withdrawing from physical contacts and tensing her muscles in order to avoid response has acquired a set of nervous and muscular co-ordinations which she does not unlearn easily after marriage." But fortunately, in these days when petting to various degrees is as prevalent among the young as Dr. Kinsey's tables show it to be, and as we all know it to be, not many American girls develop the habit of "tensing their muscles" and "withdrawing from physical contacts."

I should say the soundest argument for pre-marital coitus

is that it affords a kind of trial marriage in which the partners can discover whether they are well-mated, physiologically, psychologically and intellectually, before they give hostages to the law. It is a safety valve for young couples who, all unknowingly, may be impelled only by the sex drive, not by any real need to form a lifetime union.

. . . high over the windmill

It would seem to me, too, that learning to reach orgasm, if it's a skill that has to be learned, is less important by way of preparation for marriage than education of the emotions. On this score, Dr. Kinsey says that "learning to respond emotionally to a sexual partner may contribute to the effectiveness of one's other, non-sexual relationships." This is an understatement, where the young woman's emotional involvement is complete. For being in love and expressing love, withholding nothing, matures and deepens a person as no other experience can. So if I had a daughter who was a girl of courage, able to bear the pain that comes when the golden days pass, I should not grieve to see her throw her hat high over the windmill. Still, I should hope that she had chosen a partner who was capable of the same degree of emotional commitment as herself.

But I *should* be disturbed if a daughter of mine set out to acquire sexual experience *qua* experience—to prepare herself for marital coitus, as Dr. Kinsey, for all his protestations that he gives no advice, does advise. For certainly the aim of all of us, old and young, should be to learn to live more deeply, not more shallowly.

As a scientist who takes his responsibility to society seriously, Dr. Kinsey is a shade too ready to discount the possibility and the unfortunate aspects of pregnancy as a result of pre-marital relations. His statistics show that out of a sample of 2,094 white females, adolescent to forty years of age, who had had pre-marital coitus, nearly eighteen per cent, or 376, had become pregnant, and fifty-six had been pregnant more than once, pre-maritally. While a number of these pregnancies occurred following an engagement, Dr. Kinsey fails to tell us how many were terminated by physically dangerous and emotionally scarring abortions. This, by the way, is a word that is

not indexed in the book, any more than the words love, emotion or tenderness are.

Ignoring the temptations and the dangers of abortion as he does, Dr. Kinsey blandly assures whatever young people may read his book that "the probability that a pregnancy may result from any particular act of coitus is extremely low," only one pregnancy, according to his calculations, having resulted from 1,000 copulations engaged in by unmarried females. He goes on to say (p. 327), "Considering the effectiveness of modern contraceptives and the exceedingly few failures which we have recorded for the condom or diaphragm when properly used, there is, today, practically no necessity for such a pregnancy rate in pre-marital coitus."

There would be no necessity for such a rate, it's true, if young people were not proverbially reckless, often hasty, and sometimes more or less intoxicated by alcohol.

Much that is left out of the present volume, and much that is included leaves the reader with the inescapable and uncomfortable impression that Kinsey, the scientist, writes as a man with a mission. A mission not only to break down senseless sexual taboos—a job that he has done admirably—but to encourage more and better coitus. This is a *summum bonum*, he appears to believe, devoutly to be worked for. But since men and women are more sensitively and imaginatively constituted than the infra-human mammals, it takes more than coitus with orgasm "to combine two in one and heal the human sore."

Love isn't lacking in Kinsey
ONE FAMILY'S VIEW

Mrs. W.

OF ALL THE CONTRIBUTORS to this volume, Mrs. W. is the only one who is not an expert, at least in the ordinary sense of the word. She speaks her views on Kinsey as an ordinary mother, though in this sense she can certainly be considered an expert, being the mother of four, all in their teens. And in the matter of the education of her children on sexual matters she has taken a scientific approach, and the results, from all reports, qualify her as an expert, at least in this sphere.

Mrs. W.'s views on the Kinsey studies are significant in another respect, for in many ways she can be considered representative of the women interviewed by Kinsey. She is college-educated, in her early forties, and has been a city-dweller for a good part of her life, though now she lives with her husband, who is a lawyer, and her children in a rural community not far from New York City. She was born a Quaker, has taught school, and has been active in such groups as the League of Women Voters, parents' associations, local youth centres.

We have asked Mrs. W. how the Kinsey Report on Women affected her and her children, if she learned from it or found it useful in terms of their sexual education, and also how her children reacted if and when they read "reports" on the Report. To these questions Mrs. W. has come up with a number of pertinent answers—among them, that her children and their friends did not have an "extraordinary" interest in the Report, and that is probably typical of children who have received adequate sex information in their homes; that the Kinsey Report has been reassuring on problems such as masturbation; that one of her daughters provided her with the distinction between "petting" and "necking," not found in the Report. One thing emphasised by Mrs. W. has already been pointed out by some of our experts—that one of the main problems of sex education is the emotional reactions of parents. And she concludes—though on this point at least some of our experts would disagree—that consideration of love isn't lacking in Kinsey, that every page, carefully read, makes one wonder about it, that in fact the whole Report emphasises the importance of love.

ONE FAMILY'S VIEW

Mrs. W.

M—— was eleven years old and had been introduced to the intricacies and mysteries of the school library, for the sixth grade was to take charge of its circulation that year.

I asked him what he thought of it, the books he found there and the system of arranging and lending them.

He said, "It's a swell place. They have a lot of books. You know they are on all different subjects. But," he added, thoughtfully, "I don't know that it is such a good library. The two subjects I'm most interested in there are no books on."

"Really," I said, surprised, for I knew the library well and thought it an excellent one for a grade school. "Maybe you haven't learned the system of looking them up. It is rather baffling at first. What are you most interested in?"

"Taxidermy and sex, and I can't find anything on either one."

I was amused. But he was right. There was nothing on taxidermy and the books on sex were in the top shelves behind locked doors.

"I don't know much about taxidermy," I told him, "but I do know something about sex and I'll get you a book if you'd like."

He said that would be fine, that he and Dick had thought about sending for a book in plain wrapper that had been advertised in a magazine, but they hadn't gotten around to it, and they weren't sure it was what they wanted anyway.

The next day I got a couple of pre-adolescent's books on sex from the top shelves—*The Body and How It Works* and *Wonders of Life*. The school psychologist was there when I took them from the library, and I asked her whether she thought I should read the books with him. She said not, but to give them to him to read alone. She suggested I be available for questions.

"Of course," she added, "it would not be a bad idea to have his father discuss it with him."

I was thankful his father was away at the time, for I could think of no one less interested in the growth of pubic hair and photographs of "butterfly on flower" and "bumble bee on apple blossom." After all, I had given him the books, not his father. As it happened he certainly didn't read them alone—but with six other boys. They all came home from school with him, played a listless game of catch in the front yard for ten minutes and then scrambled up to M——'s room for the rest of the afternoon. It took them two afternoons to finish the books. On the second visit they didn't bother to play ball but made a bee-line upstairs. When they had finished the books they came down, thanked me politely for a nice time and went home. They never came back together again. M—— gave the books back to me and when I said he might like to keep them longer he said no, he'd finished. That was that. If I had anticipated a long involved discussion of sex I was quite disappointed. I never knew what his immediate questions were nor whether or not he got satisfactory answers. I was grateful to Dr. Levine and his colleagues, authors of the books, for simplifying things for me. M——, now at the age of nineteen, says he has only the vaguest recollection of the incident, so I conclude it was all a normal, logical, educational process, with no emotional repercussions.

The father of one of these school friends was an able psychiatrist who had written such books for adolescents. D——'s father would have gladly furnished his son with any information he'd wanted. The point was that the books were not available when the boys were ready for them. Only a chance remark from M—— got them off the top shelf and into the boys' hands. Even these books, I decided after reading them, were inadequate.

"Gracious," I thought, "what are they going to do when their sex life gets really involved."

I learned how the youngsters handled that later on.

P——, fifteen, being of independent mind, decided that she must take a job for the summer; that staying home taking care of her two horses and doing odd jobs about the place, swimming and riding, was not exciting enough. What she really wanted was companionship of boys and girls of her own age. She got little of that, living two miles from the village. The only job available, since she was under the minimum working

age of sixteen, was as junior counsellor in a day camp. It was a camp for the children of New York City families who rented two-room cottages, close together on a tract of land with a pond known as a bungalow colony. Most of the other counsellors were the older children of families who had in their earlier years been in the camp, and they lived and went to school in New York City. One evening, after dinner, when P—— was helping me and her older sister, aged seventeen, put the dishes into the dishwasher, she said "Say, did you know that sixty-four per cent of females have had an orgasm before marriage?"

"What do you mean?" asked S——.

"And the female is not stimulated by nude pictures as is the male," she continued.

Sex talk is common in the family. I should not have thought twice if she had said, "Why is that dog hanging around Penny? Didn't you have her sprayed last spring?" or "The dance at school was a flop last night. The social director was furious and I don't blame him. It was a real good band and all the kids stayed outside necking."

But P——'s remark were outside the usual run of conversation, in fact, outside her experience and vocabulary, so it seemed to me.

S—— asked her again what an orgasm was. She said it was hard to explain, and turned to me. I told her I'd say it was the climax of sexual intercourse, and asked her who she was quoting.

"Oh, didn't you know that the Kinsey Report on the human female came out today?"

I said, "No, I didn't. Have you read it?"

"No," she answered, "the kids at camp read the morning paper and the articles on it and told us all about it."

Apparently the counsellors, boys and girls of her own age, had discussed isolated facts that had been found in the paper. They quoted statistics about the unmarried female, not about the married woman, and discussed it as the latest news, a little more exciting than usual because of the sex element, and the boys offered most of the information. It was never again discussed by the group.

Two months later, P—— asked her friends at boarding school what they thought about the Report. Only a few of them knew about it. None of them had read anything about

it and none of them were interested in seeing it. I asked her to explain this, as the reaction was so different from that of her friends at camp. She said, "Why, I think it's because they come from better homes. They know all they want to know about sex and just aren't interested." She is right. The majority of the parents of these boys and girls are college graduates. The children have been to schools where questions on sex have been met as they have arisen; they have been more frankly faced than in the New York public schools. They are on the average country children, who rub up against life more than city children do.

One of the problems of sex education is the emotional reaction of the parent. The parent, not the child, is the problem. One of my boys, at the age of five, was involved in sex-play with some other children at nursery school. The teacher asked me what I thought about it and I told her that I thought there would always be a certain amount of such play in any group and that I was mainly concerned because I thought it unsanitary. Somewhat relieved, she told me that one parent was so upset that she was almost hysterical and was unable to discuss it with the teacher. When she eventually calmed down and tried to discuss it, she didn't have the vocabulary, although she was an educated, intelligent woman. Personally, I was more concerned about the parent than the child in this incident.

The lucky child is the one whose parent doesn't find out about his or her sex experiments.

I don't for a moment think I know all about the experiences that my children have had. When they tell me now about the devilish things they have done, such as jumping from the twelve-foot-high balcony to the sofa below, posting one of the crew to keep watch for my return, I realise I don't know the half of what they have done or are doing. What's more I don't want to know. If I did I would be over-anxious, certainly take away a lot of their courage and freedom, and try to do all their thinking. They have to learn to make their own decisions and take consequences—good or bad. Besides they are entitled to a certain privacy, as children, as well as adults.

The Kinsey Report makes parents realise how little real information they have on sex in general. It also reassures them on the problems they have. Maybe their youngsters are quite

Comm.

normal after all. It seems to me I've spent days, all told, attending parents' meetings, mothers' conferences, courses on child training. There are always recurring questions—the comic books, horror movies on the television shows. At the lower level, in small, serious-minded groups, there's the problem of bed wetting, and if you have the good leader who inspires the mothers' confidence, masturbation is always discussed. The child guidance counsellor tells you it is normal. But seldom is the parent reassured. There are fears and superstitions always in the background and not dispelled by the school adviser. How much more reassuring to read cold statistics such as:

"Sixty-two per cent of all females in the sample had masturbated at some time in the course of their lives. We have not been able to find evidence that any (of these) disturbances could have been caused by masturbation."

Another discussion involving the Kinsey Report started in the kitchen while putting the dishes in the washer. I can't explain the reason for our talks over the dishwasher, except that we were all busy that summer and that was the only free, uninterrupted time we had. These discussions certainly were not anticipated. Nor were they confined to the female members of the family. The boys came and went as they pleased. They mostly went, for the subject was not enticing enough to warrant staying with the dirty dishes and the work.

P——, my fifteen-year-old, had just finished a year at the public school where her seventeen-year-old sister had been the year before. She said, "S——, you know Carl in our class. Isn't he a queer?"

"Yes, he is a Christine Jorgenson," said S——.

"That's what I thought." P—— went on, scraping plates.

"What's that?" I asked. "What do you mean?" being pretty sure of their meaning.

"You know, a boy that might be a girl. He doesn't act like a boy much, kind of feminine."

"Didn't you discuss homosexuals when talking about the Kinsey Report at camp?" I asked. "Maybe you don't know what a homosexual person is."

"Well, yes, kind of."

They didn't. News stories of Christine Jorgenson were all they had read. They were mostly interested in boys who were
of them.

known as "queers," not having any interest in girls and being rather feminine in appearance, who probably had some female characteristic which they were uncertain about. I explained that such a Jorgenson-type of person was rare. I also explained that there were homosexual people, who were not physically abnormal, but who preferred having sexual relations with individuals of the same sex. I recalled the Kinsey Report and its indication that environment and emotional development was a cause of homosexuality.

Skipping over eight intervening years, the same lad, my son M——, now nineteen and in college, startled me by remarking as we were driving out from the city one day, "John's driving home from the West in his jalopy by way of New Orleans, so he can have a woman. They are easy to get down there. There is a whole street of them."

I suddenly felt a kind of blankness come over me. What could I say? I thought I knew something of sex in general, but darn little about prostitution—in fact, very little about the nineteen-year-old boy and his sexual habits.

I recalled what little I knew. There was Ethel Waters' autobiography and her description of Clifton Street, but that was some years ago. I had seen some unsavoury old women and some rather attractive young girls, out of the corner of my eye, along a back street near the Montparnasse station in Paris, but that was Paris. I had seen "Mr. Roberts" on the stage; never finished *I'm Here to Eternity*—not much help.

I checked myself from saying "I don't think that is a good idea," and "He'd better watch out for syphilis."

I wanted to say "I wish you wouldn't run around with John. I don't particularly like him." But that was pure rationalisation, for I'd known John a long time, his parents, too, and I was, or rather always had been, fond of him, and M—— knew it.

I could have lamely suggested, "Have you spoken to your father about this?" I knew well enough he would do so if he wanted to without my pushing. After all he had opened the subject with me, and expected something from me.

Well, I had let him down. I had discussed every conceivable subject with him—modern art, religion, how to run a ski race, his last girl, Communism, but not this—the sex

problem of the nineteen-year-old male. I had been able to manage it all right when he was eleven, but no longer. I changed the subject.*

Later I spoke to a friend of mine with children somewhat older, who discussed sex freely with them. "Heavens!" she exclaimed. "I don't know what I would have said. Maybe you should have asked him what the possibility (of prostitution) was around here." Together, my friend and I went over what facts we had on the subject which amounted to: it was a problem in the army, but the medical staff had it on their minds and was working on it; New York, seemed to have cleared up such activities, so the politicians think; there aren't even any burlesque shows on 42nd Street any more; an occasional "racket" comes out in the paper, but it never involves anyone we know and we'd consider them perverts.

We turned to *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*, (p. 300): "Contributing factors (to increase of pre-marital coitus) was the drive against organised prostitution which was stimulated in part by the experiences with venereal disease in the first World War. While the number of prostitutes does not seem to have materially reduced—the frequencies with which American males went to prostitutes had been reduced . . . Our data indicates that the frequencies of the total amount of pre-marital coitus were not materially modified for the males because the frequencies of coitus with females who were not prostitutes had increased"; and to page 323: ". . . over forty per cent of males want to marry virgins, only twenty-three per cent of females express the same desire. . . . In this attempt to solve the conflict between sexual nature of the human male and the pattern imposed by this code on the human female, the institution of prostitution has been widely accepted." There were facts on the reaction and behaviour of prostitutes. There was the proof that the teen-age and twenty-year-old male responds sexually more frequently than the older male.

What did it add up to? Certainly not a quick and ready answer, or good advice to the teen-ager on the "call girl system," but at least we had a few facts to think about. Now that the ice is broken we may be able to find more information on the subject that has been kept hush-hush for respectable mothers.

it was headline news. They all went in the waste basket as he said he'd read about it in the *Paris Tribune*. I thought he wasn't interested in it until I found him curled up with the book the first evening it was in the house.

"Now you see what our problem is," he said. "The male's highest frequency of sexual activity is during the teens."

"Sure, but what can I do about it," I answered.

"It's the economic system, that's what it is," he said. "You can't marry until you can make some money. That's what's wrong."

The next evening he said, "Look here. It says fifty per cent of the married females have had pre-marital sex relations and seventy-seven per cent have no regrets—no regrets. Why do you make such a row about pre-marital relations?"

I hadn't been aware of having made any comment on the subject, although he was right; I undoubtedly would have advised against it if the occasion had arisen.

"Seventy-seven per cent. So what?" I said. He made no comment.

"All right," I went on, "seventy-seven per cent. That's a large percentage. That gives you a free rein, doesn't it?"

He thought for a while. "No, it doesn't. There is still society to contend with."

"Maybe society's pressure isn't as great as you think," I answered.

"There are a lot of things not considered here though. What about love? They don't mention that. That's not mentioned and that's very important."

"Thank goodness," I thought, "he can read statistics with some intelligence." I wondered, "What does he know about love? Is it something that we've taught him, or that he has learned in the family or is it always present in every intelligent sensitive person?" Through the 800 pages of the Report nothing is said about love, yet through every page thoughtfully read one keeps saying: "What about the importance of love? What about love?"

Later I showed M—the articles from the *Cosmopolitan* by Amram Scheinfeld, pointing out with indignation how he belittles the Report and quoting him as saying "It may be referring not to people you know but to a couple of other females somewhere else."

"O.K." said M—. "But he's right at the end. Listen,

he says—'The young woman was dreamily awake, her head snuggled against her husband's shoulder and I watched her eyes look up at him adoringly and then move down to her baby and then back to her husband again . . . It came over me suddenly what was lacking in the Kinsey treatise—motherhood and love.'"

"You have a point—a good one," I said, and thought, there it is again. It isn't lacking in the Kinsey treatise. It is shouted from cover to cover. The whole report emphasises the importance of love.

As the twig is bent

SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE YOUNG HUMAN FEMALE AND MALE

Frank J. Curran, M.D.

FRANK J. CURRAN is Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry at the University of Virginia Medical School, and Director of the Children's Service Centre of Charlottesville and Albemarle County, Virginia. Most of his career as a psychiatrist has been devoted to working with children and adolescents.

Dr. Curran was on the faculty of New York University Medical School for many years, and organised and directed the adolescent ward in Bellevue Psychiatric Hospital. A graduate of the University of Minnesota Medical School, he has studied at Boston Psychopathic Hospital, Bellevue Hospital, the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and the Louisville Mental Hygiene Clinic. He is secretary of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, President of the American Association of Psychiatric Clinics for Children, and a member of the Council of the American Psychiatric Association.

SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE YOUNG HUMAN FEMALE AND MALE

Frank J. Curran

As a psychiatrist who has spent the major portion of his professional career working with children and adolescents, I should like to record my reactions to the chapter dealing with "Pre-adolescent Sexual Development."

In this chapter, the authors point out that there are children, both male and female, who are capable of true sexual responses. About four per cent of the women studied thought that they were responding sexually by five years of age, and nearly sixteen per cent recalled such responses by ten years. Some twenty-seven per cent reported sexual arousal before the age of adolescence; about half of these, fourteen per cent, reached orgasm either in masturbation or in sexual contacts with other persons. Some thirty per cent of the series remembered pre-adolescent heterosexual play. These experiences were usually limited to one or a few episodes, and were restricted to a single year.

This last observation fits in with the clinical observations of psychiatrists, probation officers, and others who deal with sexual delinquencies in children. The majority of such children do not continue their homo- or heterosexual acts after their appearance in a psychiatric clinic or juvenile court.

The authors state that these pre-adolescent sex acts provided the first opportunity for children to secure sexual information; as a result of these acts, they acquired factual information about sexual anatomy, about reproduction, techniques of intercourse, etc. The authors observe that these pre-adolescent sexual acts are rarely carried over into the overt sexual activity of the adolescent and adult female; they state that only eight per cent continued coitus, and five per cent persisted in homosexual acts.

When these pre-adolescent girls had sexual contacts with

other pre-adolescents, there appeared to be an equal number of male and female partners. With girls, the activity involved some touching of the genitals with the hands; three per cent recalled mouth-genital contact. When pre-adolescent boys were involved, genital exhibit occurred in ninety-nine per cent and, in forty per cent, this was all that was involved. The authors believe that warnings not to exhibit their own genitals, plus the curiosity to learn about others, were the driving forces in such exhibitionistic activity. Some sort of attempt at coitus occurred in seventeen per cent of those girls reporting pre-adolescent heterosexual experiences; this consisted chiefly of apposition of the organs.

The authors make a definite differentiation between adolescence and the first menstrual period. They state that the appearance of pubic hair, enlargement of the breasts and increase in body size occur, on an average, 8.4 months before the first menstrual period. They believe that adolescence begins with the pubic hair appearance and breast changes. They point out that the initial release of mature eggs from the ovaries is not always correlated with menstruation, and that there are known cases of pregnancy occurring before menstruation ever began.

In pre-Freudian days, many people preferred to believe that children did not participate actively in sexual relations with others, and that they had no sexual urges or curiosity. It is now conceded quite widely in medical circles that both male and female children engage in sex-play. Exhibitionism in pre-school children is very common; such children are pre-occupied with the differences in their own sex organs and those of persons of the opposite sex. A high percentage of children engage in masturbation and attempt to fondle the genitals of other children until they are curbed or punished by adults.

When a psychiatrist reports his observations of such activities he is told frequently that he is dealing only with abnormal individuals. The inference is made that normal children do not have such interest or activities. The contrary can be observed, however, when children are allowed to play without restrictions in nursery schools, play-grounds, etc. Physicians, nurses, teachers, recreational workers corroborate the data presented on this subject of pre-adolescent sexuality in the female as well as in the male.

Parents who remember their own sexual activities in childhood frequently become upset when they see such manifestations in their children. They become more disturbed about this conduct than they do about other childhood activities. They tend to punish their children as if in an attempt to deny that they have ever had such urges or experiences. They frequently threaten or punish the child in the same manner in which they themselves were punished as children.

Because of the close relationship of the organs of urination and sex, parents frequently associate bed-wetting with sex-play, and they are more upset about this symptom than about neurotic manifestations. They subject their children to various types of punishments, physical or psychological, so that this practice will not continue.

In discussing the background for sexual activities in children, the authors make what appear to be contradictory statements. They state (on p. 111) that children are interested in anatomic differences, and that their curiosity is aggravated when they are forbidden to expose their nude bodies, or have an opportunity to see the nude bodies of other children. The authors believe that much of the emotional content which sex-play has for girls is a reaction to the mysterious and forbidden. The authors then state that many of their subjects were raised in homes that accepted nudity within the family circle, or who attended nursery schools or summer camps where pre-adolescent boys and girls used the same toilets and freely bathed and played together in the nude: such children were reported, however, as being interested in examining the bodies of other children. The authors state further that sixty per cent of the adult female subjects believe that they saw male genitals between the ages of two and five, that twenty-four per cent saw them between the ages of five and eleven, that ninety per cent had seen male genitals before they reached adolescence. Some thirty-seven per cent had seen the genitals of adult males, including their own fathers. It would appear, therefore, that curiosity did not play the important role inferred by these authors, inasmuch as their curiosity was apparently satisfied, and yet thirty per cent had pre-adolescent heterosexual experiences. One might, however, consider that this finding is not contradictory, if one were to assume that the reported thirty per cent of heterosexual experiences consisted chiefly of merely seeing the male exhibit his sex parts.

In discussing the heterosexual relations of pre-adolescent girls with *adult* males, the authors indicate that only three per cent had actual coitus, and that sixty-two per cent of contacts were only verbal approaches or genital exhibition. From the information which they secured from their subjects, they doubted if many of these adult men desired to proceed to specific sexual contacts. They also state they feel quite certain that only an exceedingly small proportion of the adult male exhibitionists would have done any physical damage to a child. They state that records in penal institutions indicate that there are very few cases of rapists who start out as exhibitionists.

Such conclusions are quite significant because of the publicity given to sexual crimes and because of the fear that physical injury is a frequent consequence of any sexual approach by an adult male.

My own observation, as well as those of my former colleagues working on the Prison Ward in Bellevue Hospital and in the Psychiatric Clinic of the Court of General Sessions in New York City, are in agreement with these authors. It is very rare for an exhibitionist to resort to *physical* contacts with or to do any *physical harm* to children or adults. Of the 4,441 females on whom the authors have information, only one received a serious physical injury from a male.

The authors point out, however, that there are *emotional* disturbances as a result of such contact in about eighty per cent of children having such experiences. However, they, as well as many other observers, have concluded (and accurately, I believe) that these psychological effects are primarily the result of the emotional disturbances of parents, police officers, or other adults who discover that the child has had such a sexual contact.

My own reactions from reading this particular chapter, and also taking into account the remainder of the book (which I have also read), are that these authors have made a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of sexuality in children, and that their recommendations for a more widespread sexual education should be given great weight. Although the material in this book is based on a study of some 5,940 women, the findings are comparable to those studies of various social scientists working in urban and rural areas in various parts of the country. It is my opinion that the content of this

book should be made available not only to physicians, psychologists, and social workers, but also to teachers, clergymen and parents. It is important that children and adolescents receive adequate sexual information from authorities who have studied this subject very thoroughly. At present such information is frequently obtained only from other children. Of the women studied by these authors only five per cent received any sexual information from their parents or clergy. The majority of them acquired their earliest information from other children. The observations of child psychiatrists reveal that the children whom they study and treat usually have inaccurate and inadequate sexual knowledge, which neither satisfies the children's curiosity nor provides them with information with which they could protect themselves from sexual assaults, pregnancy or venereal disease. Because of their curiosity, children frequently permit sexual contact with others which may have a serious psychological effect on them for many years, and may interfere not only with satisfactory adjustments in marriage but even social contacts with adults of either or both sexes.

I am not recommending that children read this book, but I am recommending that parents, physicians, teachers, clergy, school advisers, etc. use this as one of the source works for imparting knowledge of sexual anatomy, physiology, and psychology to those in their care.

The effect of the future on the present

SEX AND THE FEMALE CHARACTER

Eli Ginzberg, Ph.D.

ELI GINZBERG is Professor of Economics in the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University and Director of the University's "Conservation of Human Resources" Project. He has always had a special interest in the relationship between sexual behaviour and economics, and in his opinion a knowledge of the facts of sexual behaviour is of great importance to the formulators of economic theory and policy.

At present Dr. Ginzberg is also Director of Research of the National Manpower Council of Columbia University, consultant to the Secretary of the Army and to the U.S. Surgeon General's Office, and economic adviser to various professional groups. In the course of his distinguished career as an economist he has held such positions as U.S. Representative to the Five Power Conference on Reparations for Non-Repatriable Refugees, Medical Consultant to the Hoover Commission, and Director of the Resources Analysis Division of the U.S. Surgeon General's Office. During the summer of 1953 he was a consultant to the Technical Co-operation Administration of U.S. State Department in Israel.

Among Dr. Ginzberg's numerous books are *Psychiatry and Military Manpower Policy*, *The Uneducated*, *Occupational Choice*, *Agenda for American Jews*, *The Unemployed*, and *Grass on the Slag Heaps*.

SEX AND THE FEMALE CHARACTER

Eli Ginzberg

I. What Type of Book Did Kinsey Write?

There are many ways of assessing Kinsey's *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*. Some students praise the book for its presentation of a tremendous body of data about a most important, though hitherto largely unstudied, sector of human behaviour. Others concentrate on the technical limitations of Kinsey's methodology, and point out errors in sampling, collating, analysing, and evaluating this great mass of data.

Still others who have little interest in the scientific merits of the book consider it solely in terms of its impact upon private behaviour and public policy. Of these, some enthusiastically contend that the book will make a contribution to the emotional stability of many women who are guilt-ridden because of their deviating behaviour, while others as vigorously but disapprovingly maintain that the book will be used to justify immoral practices.

Some of the most penetrating reactions to Kinsey and his work come from scholars who focus not on what Kinsey has attempted to do but on what he has failed to do. The psychiatrists emphasise that sexual behaviour in the human cannot be studied within the narrow framework that Kinsey has established, a framework that considers sexual behaviour almost exclusively in such naturalistic terms as outlets and incidence. The sociologists emphasise Kinsey's neglect of the role of social institutions in conditioning sexual attitudes and behaviour.

It is ungracious to complain that Kinsey did not write the type of book one might have hoped he would have written. Kinsey might counter the criticism of the psychiatrists and sociologists by emphasising that he never presumed to exhaust the entire field of sexual behaviour, but had attempted to advance our understanding by adding to our factual knowledge. He could reasonably contend that without such data as he and his associates have collected, understanding about

human sexual behaviour would remain severely limited, for scholars would have no firm basis in fact to test their theories.

While no single book can ever exhaust a complicated subject, surely not such a fundamental one as sex, every work is not necessarily a valuable contribution. Whether it is or not depends on whether it makes a contribution to the advance of knowledge and understanding. It is difficult to decide, however, whether Kinsey's recent investigation into the sexual behaviour of the human female really is important. Judgment is rendered difficult because Kinsey was much more concerned with collecting and organising his large body of data than with interpreting its meaning. Although it is difficult to utilise effectively the data which others collect, it may be that Kinsey's major contribution is having made available so much raw material.

He has collected a great wealth of data concerning the outlets and incidence of sexual behaviour among females. Most of his book is given over to detailed enumerations concerning the six principal types of outlet and the variations in incidence which he has found to obtain among different groups of females. Kinsey does not limit himself completely to this plane of analysis, for he does consider female sexual behaviour in relation to male sexual behaviour and in relation to physiological and social determinants. But, first and foremost, his is a naturalistic approach which is concentrated on the mechanisms and incidence of sexual behaviour.

There is widespread agreement among competent scientists that significant progress in research depends not so much on the accumulation of data as on the formulation of suggestive and challenging hypotheses which can be proved or disproved by relevant data. This is another way of saying that discrete facts have little or no value in and by themselves, but are important to the extent that they contribute to the formulation of more valid generalisations about behaviour.

It may, therefore, be helpful to outline a series of hypotheses about female sexual behaviour suggested by Kinsey's rich materials. These hypotheses are concerned with the reasons for significant differences in the sexual behaviour of men and women; of women of previous generations and women today; among women with different personality structures; and, finally, among women from different socio-economic backgrounds.

II. Four Hypotheses About Female Sex Behaviour

The four hypotheses which follow have one element in common. In each instance the sexual behaviour of the female is interpreted against the background of her attitude toward the future consequences of her actions. The role of the future in determining sexual behaviour has been previously outlined by this author in an essay in "Sex and Class Behaviour," in *About the Kinsey Report*, edited by Donald Porter Geddes and Enid Curie. Ever since Adam and Eve were expelled from Paradise, it has been necessary to study pleasure in relation to pain—or consequences—for man must pay a price for the satisfaction which he gains.

The first hypothesis is this: *The consequences of sex are not the same for women as for men.* For physiological reasons, women are much more concerned about the consequences of sexual intercourse than men. It is necessary only to refer to the fact that women have hymens and bear children and men do not. This hypothesis suggests that among persons drawn from the same portion of the population the incidence of pre-marital and extra-marital heterosexual intercourse would be substantially greater among men than among women. Kinsey's findings tend to confirm this.

The second hypothesis is this: *A reduction in the risk of serious consequences results in an increase in the incidence of pre-marital and extra-marital sexual behaviour among women.* It is always difficult to perceive clearly and evaluate soundly large-scale changes that have taken place in the recent past. However, it is clear that the role of women in American society has undergone revolutionary changes during this century.

During this period it has been possible for the first time for large numbers of women in the Western world to lead useful and meaningful lives outside of matrimony. Most women still are supported by their father or brother before marriage and by their husband or son after marriage, but as never before women can choose not to marry and to live independent lives.

This has also been a period of increasing spiritual emancipation for women. Emancipation has also been influenced by the weakening of organised religion, the emergence of the

new psychology, and, perhaps most important, by the gains of liberalism and democracy with their emphasis upon the rights and privileges of every individual.

Last and perhaps most important has been the widespread diffusion of increasingly safe and inexpensive methods of birth control. For the first time in human history procreation is not the inevitable consequence of sexual activity.

Thus the past several generations have seen a reduction in the risk which women assume when they engage in pre-marital or extra-marital intercourse. It is not surprising that Kinsey's figures reveal increases in such sexual behaviour among the younger women in his sample.

Kinsey is repeatedly impressed with the wide differences in sexual activity even among members of the same group. These differences are reflected not only in the age when women first engage in sexual intercourse, but, equally significant, in the frequency of their activity. The third hypothesis postulates that *the importance which a woman attaches to sexual activity depends in large measure upon her other values and goals.*

It would be impossible to determine from Kinsey's published data the validity of the proposition that certain women use sex as the primary instrumentality for accomplishing their life's goals. But many of the young women who engage early and frequently in pre-marital intercourse, as well as those who make one or more carefully calculated marriages, are doing just this. Although Kinsey's data do not distinguish clearly this particular group, evidence in the daily newspapers and the divorce courts prove that there are women who use sex primarily as a means to attaining other goals.

One interesting finding in Kinsey's book does show the relations which may exist between a woman's sexual behaviour and her career goals. Kinsey found that women graduate students from poor homes engaged in pre-marital coital experience much less frequently than women who had come from upper income level homes. Kinsey believes that the girl from a lower income group is insecure in her new environment and behaves as she thinks the new group would like her to behave. But this is a surmise. It is more likely that she has made a special adjustment between her sex drive and her career goals. It is obviously extremely difficult for the daughter of a skilled mechanic to acquire a graduate education. Only a disciplined

and well-directed person is able to overcome the many handicaps, including the necessity to earn a considerable part of her expenses. This girl must be willing to make substantial sacrifices of current gratifications in order to attain her long-range goals.

This proposition, that some women exploit sex to gain specific goals while others minimise it so as not to be deflected from accomplishing important career objectives, might be argued. However, it is unlikely that any contention would arise over Kinsey's finding that sexual behaviour is definitely influenced by another important value—religious belief. Kinsey has ample data to prove that devout women have a pattern of sexual activity significantly different from those who have only a moderate or inactive relation to their church.

The fourth hypothesis holds that *women from the upper socio-economic classes will more actively seek and find sexual gratification in marriage and in extra-marital relations than women from the lower economic classes.* While Kinsey's data do not unequivocally validate the foregoing formulation, they definitely support it. Once again the element of futurity is significant in an attempt to understand these differences in sexual behaviour. A woman who must care for a brood of young children and run her household on a limited budget clearly is more burdened and preoccupied with the realities from which she cannot escape than an upper class matron with one or two children and one or two maids. Moreover, the simple matter of privacy in sexual relations is affected by the crowded living arrangements which are apt to prevail among the lower income group. It is not easy to establish a satisfactory environment for sexual intercourse where economic strain and housing limitations prevail.

The differences between women in the upper and lower income classes are even more striking with regard to extra-marital relations. This entails sizable risks for both groups, but they are much greater for the women from a lower economic class. First, there is more chance that if her husband discovers her behaviour, she will be subjected to direct bodily harm. Moreover, since she has no economic resources of her own, the risk of being thrown out or deserted is fraught with the most serious consequences for her own future and the future of her children. The possibility of divorce that might confront the woman from the upper income class if her husband decides

to terminate their marriage because of her infidelity is certainly disturbing, but the reality consequences are likely to be less devastating.

So much for the four hypotheses. In each case the formulation states that differences in sexual behaviour are substantially affected by estimates that individuals make of the future consequences of their behaviour. In each instance we have found that Kinsey's data, if they do not prove the hypothesis, are at least consistent with it. This is not surprising, for human action, in contrast to animal action, is influenced by considerations of the future.

III. Four Directions for Sexual Reform

Although he was not completely successful, Kinsey attempted to present his materials as a scientific investigator and to eschew the role of moralist and reformer. But there is no reason why an investigator who has spent so much effort in studying an important sector of human behaviour should not be permitted, in fact, encouraged, to set out his recommendations on how the sum total of human happiness can be increased. Surely he has as much right to be heard as the philosopher, the lawyer, or the priest.

But if Kinsey has the right to plead a case for reform, he must transcend the limits of his data. We noted earlier that facts, in and by themselves, contribute little to understanding. And surely alone they can contribute little to pointing the direction toward constructive reform. In Chapter Thirteen, "Total Sexual Outlet," which is the closest approximation to a summary chapter in *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*, Kinsey presents a series of propositions which are largely of a policy nature. Among the problems that he selects for discussion are those related to the influence of pre-marital sexual relations on later adjustment; differences in the pre-marital sexual experiences of men and women; the social implications of the fact that certain women, particularly teachers, do not have a normal sex life; and the difficulties of normal adjustment for women who have lost their husbands. This section will indicate how Kinsey poses each problem and will attempt to elucidate the reasoning behind his conclusions, and then will evaluate his recommendations. These illustrations do not

exhaust Kinsey's excursions into policy, but they provide an illustration of his approach to reform.

Kinsey's first assumption is *The earlier one has sexual experience, the better*. After summarising the differences in behaviour between the devout and the religiously emancipated women in his group, Kinsey states:

There seems to be no doubt that the moral restraints which lead a female to avoid sexual contact before marriage and to inhibit her responses when she does make contact, may also effect her capacity to respond erotically later in life. We shall not solve the problem of female "frigidity" until we realise that it is a man-made situation, and not the product of innate physiological incapacity in those females.

The line of this argument appears to be as follows: devout attitudes inhibit pre-marital sexual behaviour; such inhibitions will have an adverse affect on the ability of women to respond erotically in marriage. Kinsey implies that a change is called for in the religious upbringing of girls and young women unless society desires to continue to produce a large number of sexually frustrated adults.

In answer to this it can be said, briefly, that continence may be a deprivation, but an effort to maximise *current* satisfactions is not necessarily the best way of maximising *total* satisfactions.

Secondly, Kinsey makes the assumption that *the more sexual experience one has, the better*. With respect to differences in the frequency of orgasm between males and females prior to marriage, Kinsey argues that the very much higher frequency among males is of considerable social significance:

Many males are disappointed after marriage to find that their wives are not responding regularly and are not as interested in having as frequent sexual contact as they, the males, would like to have; and a great many of the married females may be disappointed and seriously disturbed when they find that they are not responding in their coitus, and not enjoying sexual relations as they had anticipated they would. Not a few of the divorces which occur within the first year or two of marriage are the product of these discrepancies between the sexual background of the average female and the average male.

Kinsey found that the number of orgasms prior to marriage for the average male was seven times the number experienced by the average female. He then argues that men, having had more experience prior to marriage, have higher demands for sexual relations in marriage; women, having had less experience, frequently shy away from the amount of intercourse that their husbands desire. In addition, because their experience has been limited, women find less enjoyment than they had anticipated in coitus and are therefore disappointed and often disturbed. Many divorces result from this imbalance in pre-marital sexual experience. Kinsey implies that a change in the pre-marital sexual behaviour of women is indicated unless society desires to perpetuate the high incidence of divorce which is a result.

This second assumption can be answered as follows: Satisfaction can never be assessed solely in quantitative terms. The person who eats the most is not necessarily the person who derives greatest satisfaction from eating.

Kinsey's third assumption is that *the loss of regular sexual experience is a serious deprivation*. With respect to the loss of a husband, Kinsey found that among those women who had previously been married, only slightly more than half of their sexual experience was in the form of socio-sexual relations, heterosexual or homosexual, by the age of fifty. Kinsey goes on to say:

This provides a measure of the considerable problem which many an older individual has in making a sexual adjustment after the termination of a marriage. Although sexual relations may be significant because they satisfy a physiological need, they are more significant as factors in the development and the maintenance of an individual's personality and, consequently, may contribute to her value in the total social organisation.

This says that since death and divorce result in the termination of many marriages, many women find that their sexual life has been disrupted. They encounter difficulties in finding satisfactory alternatives; yet a normal sex life is vital if a woman is to remain stable and productive. Kinsey implies that any action that would reduce the interruption of the sexual life of women who lose their husbands would be a net individual and social gain.

In answer to the third assumption, it can be said that life is full of deprivations. The problem that people face is how to cope with serious deprivations without major loss of personal equilibrium.

Kinsey makes a fourth assumption that *without regular sexual experience a person is almost certain to be emotionally unbalanced*. After presenting his finding that more than a quarter of the older unmarried females in his study had never experienced orgasm at any time in their lives, Kinsey argues that:

when such frustrated or sexually unresponsive, unmarried females attempt to direct the behaviour of other persons, they may do considerable damage.

He goes on to say:

parents, and particularly the males in the population, might debate the wisdom of making such women responsible for the guidance of youth.

The line of this argument is simple: Many women never experience orgasm; this means that they are sexually unresponsive or frustrated; it is dangerous to permit such women to guide the youth of the country; parents, particularly fathers, should concern themselves with this threat to the well-being of their children. Kinsey implies that a change is called for in the qualifications for employment of women, particularly unmarried women, in the fields of teaching and related areas. Only those with a normal sex life should be trusted with the young.

Our rebuttal to Kinsey's fourth assumption is that continence need not lead to neurosis or psychosis, and there is no known relation between continence and work performance. Many who have regular sexual experiences are seriously disturbed in their work and in other aspects of their lives.

IV. Sex and Life

Every society is confronted with a "sex problem" in the sense that it must consider how best to channelise and limit the sexual propensities of its members which cannot be given completely free rein without jeopardising its very foundations.

There have been wide variations in the approaches of various societies to regulation and control, but without exception every society has been forced to introduce some limitations to the free expression of the sexual instinct in order to safeguard and enhance other values. Although there are many prohibitions and interdictions about sexual behaviour that are grounded in specific religious and ethnic beliefs, the core of the regulative principle in every group is the relation of sexual behaviour to the integrity of the family. Since the family cannot exist in the face of total sexual licence, it has been necessary from the beginning of recorded history for men to circumscribe and delimit the expression of the drive for sexual qualification. It is interesting to note in passing that a prototype of the human system of control exists among the primates and for the same reason: the necessity to provide some stability for the primate family. •

We have seen that Kinsey's data illuminated the rather striking differences in the sexual behaviour of various groups of women in American society. We have further seen that one interpretation of these differences can be found in the value systems of these groups and the place of sex within these value systems. Further, we have seen that the revolutionary changes which have taken place in American society—particularly the widespread introduction of safe and inexpensive methods of birth control, the expanded opportunities for women to become economically independent, and the increasing importance ascribed to individual freedom and happiness—have led to a reordering of values, including the recognition that women are entitled to sexual gratification.

The major impact of these changes was to lead many women to reassess the costs of engaging in pre-marital and extra-marital relations. Prior to the availability of effective methods of birth control, there was always a real possibility that sexual relations would result in conception, with all of the serious consequences that befall the unwed mother. These consequences were even more serious fifty years ago when the opportunity for women to support themselves was so circumscribed. Since marriage was the major opportunity for leading a meaningful and constructive life, it is not surprising that most women behaved in a manner to enhance their opportunities for making a satisfactory marriage.

Although Kinsey's data help to illuminate many of the

changes in behaviour that have resulted from these new and revolutionary forces, they really contribute little to understanding the problem of how different patterns of sexual behaviour are related to the integrity of the family. Yet it is just this relationship which we have found to be of central importance. Moreover, it would be an error to overstress the importance of these revolutionary forces. The fact remains that despite the striking changes which have taken place in the economic and social position of women in American life during the past half century, marriage still represents by far the most important institutional arrangement for the basic adjustment of the female. And although modern methods of birth control are remarkably safe, failures do occur, and it is the woman, not the man, who carries the responsibility. Here are two potent reasons why even now sex continues to have a different meaning for men and women.

Kinsey has moved along a single dimension of the sex problem by concentrating on the way in which society inhibits the free expression of the sexual instinct. Kinsey is convinced that there are deleterious consequences which flow from these restraints. No society has ever been fully effective in regulating and controlling sexual relations, and surely many share Kinsey's concern about the way in which our contemporary society is grappling with the problem. It is not a coincidence that various religious leaders, who have been most concerned about the integrity of the family, have been in the vanguard of those advocating early marriages in order to reduce the period of sexual frustration to a minimum.

Although the average age of marriage in the United States is at present lower than at any previous time in our history, the period between puberty and marriage for women is still approximately eight years. Moreover, early marriage is not always practical when consideration is given to the career development of the young man. And many young persons would probably make a wiser choice of a marriage mate if they delay until their middle or even late twenties.

Kinsey's data have thrown a bright searchlight on many of the difficult problems which face American society, particularly those bearing on pre-marital sexual behaviour. His data point to the continuing increases in the incidence of pre-marital sexual relations. But unfortunately his data tell us nothing about the implications and consequences of such in-

creases. It is not possible to conclude that these increases in pre-marital sexual relations are clear evidence of social progress since sexual frustration has been replaced by sexual satisfaction. For no value, such as sexual gratification, can ever stand alone, and therefore it is not possible to alter sexual behaviour without altering other important aspects of behaviour. A valid approach to contemporary sexual behaviour must relate sex to the other key values in life, particularly to the integrity of the family. Kinsey has made a contribution to such an approach, but only a small contribution.

A fresh approach . . .

THE READING OF KINSEY AS A MEANINGFUL EXPERIENCE

Edward S. Tauber, M.D.

EDWARD S. TAUBER is chairman of the faculty of the William Alanson White Institute in New York City. This is the school of psychoanalysis, sometimes called the Washington School, which has branched out from the Freudians, and puts more emphasis on the influence of interpersonal relations than upon personality development.

Dr. Tauber is associate attending psychiatrist at the Vanderbilt Clinic of Columbia University, associate psychiatrist at Columbia, and panel psychiatrist for the New York City Board of Education. During World War II he served as a division psychiatrist in the European theatre, and also at the Darnell General Hospital in Kentucky. He was a Rockefeller Sex Biology Gift Fellow and a Josiah H. Macy Foundation fellow at Columbia University, and has also been connected with the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic at Johns Hopkins University. Dr. Tauber writes frequently for professional journals, is a fellow of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and a member of a number of other professional societies. He is a graduate of Yale, and Johns Hopkins Medical School.

THE READING OF KINSEY AS A MEANINGFUL EXPERIENCE

Edward S. Tauber

The layman's quest for sexual reassurance and the scientist's quest for comforting certainly will interfere with a productive understanding and exploration of human sexuality.

Many readers of Kinsey's *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* are seeking information, possibly rather specific information, and therefore turn to the experts. It is unwarranted, however, to yield to the plausible expectation that one is going to learn solid facts, and avoid confusing and perplexing issues. The reader who aims to get some of the inherent value out of the Kinsey Report must seek to make himself part of the investigating team. The extent to which he can become participant, so to speak, in the research project which he reads about—to that degree can the Kinsey Report provide him with a meaningful experience.

Since the nature of the subject, namely the study of human sexual behaviour, is extremely challenging, one might expect that the book would be of tremendous interest to a vast audience, and of course it is. But the inescapable and inadvertent tendency to use the material to one's own ends is inherent in any type of experience where the emotional security of the human being is either consciously or unconsciously challenged. If an anxiety-charged communication confronts the reader, whether or not anxiety is experienced, reparative measures are taken in order to allay impending distress. Occasionally patients have reacted to the Kinsey Report with some frank anxiety, but it is common to see reparative processes appear, namely a defensive denial of their psychosexual problems on the grounds of having discovered that their difficulties are statistically "normal," despite the fact that their sexual behaviour fails to be an expression of real warmth and tenderness. The defensive operations then preclude anxiety, but they also preclude the possibility of learning, and by learning I do not simply mean acquiring factual information, but

learning in the broadest sense of—who am I? What am I trying to do with my life? What am I trying to say by what I do? What satisfactions do I get out of living? What satisfactions do I share with anybody? It is this level of inquiry which Kinsey's book might profitably stimulate.

It is interesting to observe that even patients who have gone into psychiatric treatment, and thus affirm some serious interest in their welfare, could easily betray a superficial and defensive approach to the material of the Kinsey Report. One might expect, therefore, that the average reader, less attuned to introspection and emotional nuances, and more conventionally healthy, might approach the Kinsey material with even less contemplation and appropriate spirit of inquiry, without which one gains very little, and in fact may be misled. How misled? One could be led into envisaging life problems, or more specifically, sexual behaviour, in terms of an inventory of unrelated items. Human experience is appraised in terms of a good score card, and that is all.

On first glance, the Kinsey Report is quite simply factual in its material. But let us realise immediately that what is presented is deceptively simple, not actually simple. Certain types of scientific research lend themselves to factual cataloguing, but such instances usually refer to the earliest beginnings in a scientific inquiry, and the subject of sexual behaviour would hardly serve such an illustration. Despite many gaps in our knowledge there is still a considerable amount of valid and workable data in the field of sexuality.

Some of the critics have asserted that Kinsey and his associates have attacked sexual behaviour as if it were a taxonomic project. I do not believe that this criticism is justified. But in some respects Kinsey and his associates have approached the problem of sexual behaviour as if precious little were known about the subject. If this statement adequately reflects Kinsey's appraisal of the state of knowledge concerning sexual behaviour, I would disagree with him—it seems to me that psychiatry and psychoanalysis have unquestionably made a signal contribution to our understanding of certain aspects of sexual behaviour. But irrespective of whatever alleged injustices and offences Kinsey has committed against his colleagues in allied fields, he is certainly justified in making a fresh approach to the problem. In addition, in all fairness to Kinsey, he has in his present volume on the female broadened the base of his studies,

and given more consideration to the role of psychological and emotional factors.

Just as the reader is tempted to seek short-cuts and over-simplified answers, the scientist, being human, is also likely to do the same thing. I can illustrate this with a problem such as the studies on the effects of castration, where it will be seen that neat answers could be had. But to accept them without recognising their inadequacy would preclude an appreciation of provocative details, which would lead one to further scientific discovery beneficial to mankind.

In setting up an experimental project, the scientific investigator directs his efforts towards fulfilling certain methodological criteria, in order to extract from nature the answer to her riddles. Thus the inquiry is directed along the lines which seem to be meaningful. The productive inquiry must be operational in structure and meaning. It must increase information, and relate to information in contiguous areas. It must offer predictive possibilities for further test and verification and, hopefully, it must not tend to interfere with further operational activity. These are the ideal goals.

The pioneers in the field of biology have, as the history of science shows us, used one basic methodological approach, among others—the removing of a part from the whole, in order to observe the after effects. This is only too well known in the specific fields of endocrinology and neurophysiology. For example, what are the effects of removing the thyroid gland or the pancreas, or what are the effects of removing the optic nerve? This type of scientific procedure, when appropriate, can yield striking information.

However, as one might expect in so complex a field as biology, the results of such a method might yield extremely perplexing information as well. Thus research into the effects of castration on the human adult male revealed something quite simple in one area, and something quite complex in another. The simple and uncomplicated discovery was that following castration procreation was prevented. The complexities appeared when one attempted to establish the effects of castration upon the sexual patterns of the individual. The effects on sexuality were not only obscure, but diverse, and in a great deal of the literature the results of the studies were hardly decipherable. One enlightening, although far from consistent, discovery in the literature was that, following castra-

tion, the adult male may not necessarily suffer serious diminution of sexual desire or impairment of the execution of the sexual act. It would seem that most investigators anticipated that the sexuality would be interfered with following castration, and broadly speaking, this was so. But is not the important part of the observation the fact that it was not always so—that there are cases on record where sexuality has not been significantly altered, even for many years after castration? These very exceptions provide the basis for further scientific exploration.

One can draw the further inference that the biological factor, although admittedly important, is not the exclusive factor, and that other things must be taken into account. One might then reasonably raise the question—are psychological factors playing a significant role in this problem?

The next step in the inquiry consisted in studying at first hand a group of castrates and following these particular cases over a period of years. These interviews revealed the importance of the subject's character make-up in determining the established sexual patterns. The psychic conflicts and the defensive manœuvres of the castrate were in no sense different from those found in the non-castrate. In other words, if the castrate was confronted with unconscious conflicts invading the psychosexual structure of his personality, he would have inhibitions and rationalised activities, just like the non-castrate. He would exhibit resistances when the conflict areas were touched upon.

It was quite interesting to observe that, despite the fact that many castrates wanted male sex hormone treatment, if they were not psychologically prepared they reacted quite ambivalently to their own conscious requests for treatment. For example, they might forget to take their medicine, or they might miss interviews, or situations might develop in their experience with other people which "prevented" sexual activity. In some cases the patient would drop out of treatment precipitously the first time he was given sex hormone, for which he had been clamouring. There were transference reactions centring around the patient's secret feeling that he was being forced to receive treatment, or that he was expected to comply. Many non-sexual components were observed to be in operation, just as one finds them to be in therapeutic situations, where the presenting complaint is sexual in nature

but where a host of non-sexual elements are involved, and need to be understood before one can expect the more direct sexual complaint to improve.

If one explored the effects of castration primarily in terms of percentages, and if one found—and it has been found—that the major trend is in the direction of diminution of sexual desire and sexual effectiveness, one might then decide that was that, and that there was nothing else to explore. Thus we see that the effects of castration upon the sexuality of the adult male do not yield an either/or answer, and that a willingness to recognise the less obvious findings leads one to further fields of inquiry.

The Psychiatrist Looks at Continence

The question is occasionally raised as to whether continence is harmful or injurious to health. But first we would have to agree on the meaning of continence. Webster's unabridged dictionary defines continence as "the restraint which a person imposes upon his desires and passions; specifically, moderation in the indulgence of sexual enjoyments."

At first glance, the question of continence would seem to involve ethical or moral issues, as well as its effects upon health. To the writer's knowledge, there is no evidence that continence as such is either healthy or unhealthy. The important thing to establish would be whether a particular instance of continence is a rationalised expression of unconscious conflict. This is the sense in which the problem might come to the attention of a psychiatrist. If the continence is the rationalised expression of some set of unconscious conflicts, then one would have to treat the patient for his conflict. Assuming that the therapeutic results were constructive, then the effect on the sexual pattern would be in the direction of a healthy psychosexual adjustment.

A healthy psychosexual adjustment would mean that the individual has the ability to have a durable intimate relationship with a person of the opposite sex, in which mutual concern is expressed, and in which each of the persons is interested in helping himself and the other to experience a full and constructive life. This would be an adjustment which expressed love and tenderness, and was not an expression of non-sexual

aims or sado-masochistic trends. The specific types of fore-pleasure, or the variants thereof, would be of no particular importance in such circumstances. Consideration for the nuances of each other's sexual responsiveness, or lack of responsiveness, would not threaten the durability of the relationship, and in that sense continence would be a positive expression in the relationship, and not a conflictual reaction.

Reappraisal of Kinsey's View on Sexual Response and Orgasm

In Chapter Fifteen Kinsey describes explicitly the physiological conditions which exist during the state of sexual arousal and orgasm. He begins by mentioning a striking characteristic of all living matter, plant or animal, namely its capacity to respond to touch. He suggests that that which produces movement away, in contrast to the innate movement toward, is probably a learned response; this negative response is tied up with complex socio-psychological conditioning. If the tactile experience, however, is a positive one, then the development may be in the direction of a recognisable sexual response.

Kinsey proceeds to discuss the scientific literature dealing with the physiological concomitants of sexual response, namely, increased pulse rate, elevation of blood pressure during orgasm. Increased peripheral flow of blood and tumescence are actually much more widespread than is commonly recognised. There is, of course, a correlative increase in respiratory rate and depth. In describing the orgasmic state Kinsey points out that, particularly at the height of orgasm, the sexually responsive individual appears to be responding to a shortage of oxygen in the tissues, similar to what might be experienced by the athlete at the peak of exertion. He states further that, although the data are limited, it would seem that bleeding from cut blood vessels is less than would be expected. Thus he says, "Skin abrasions, accidental cuts, and even cuts on the genitalia and on other tumescent parts of the body, and the injuries that may be incurred during sado-masochistic activity, seem to be remarkably free from extensive bleeding." Both in the male and in the female there are ordinarily genital secretions during sexual arousal and orgasm. Nasal and salivary secretions are also often increased.

The paragraph dealing with the reduction in sensory perception is particularly interesting. Kinsey states ". . . All of our evidence indicates that there is a considerable and developing loss of sensory capacity which begins immediately upon the onset of sexual stimulation, and which becomes more or less complete, sometimes with complete unconsciousness, during the maximum of sexual arousal and orgasm. At orgasm some individuals may remain unconscious for a matter of seconds or even for some minutes."

In discussing the nature of the reduction in sensory perception, the question is raised as to whether the attention of the individual during the sexual act is so focused that outside sensory stimulation does not enter consciousness. Kinsey indicates that there is some evidence for the existence of a state of actual anaesthesia and that probably both distraction and anaesthesia have their effects at that time. He further correlates anger, fear, and epilepsy—"all of which are phenomena that are physiologically related to sexual response." The observation is made that the sexually aroused individual becomes more and more insensitive to tactile stimulation of an even severe type and that the sense of pain is largely obliterated. The data from persons who engaged in sado-masochistic activities during the sexual act would tend to confirm this.

There is also a diminution in the sense of sight, hearing, smell, and taste. The temperature sense is claimed to be diminished, since it is not unusual for persons to be unconscious of extremes of outside temperature during the sexual act. Kinsey's data also indicate that amputees known to have phantom limb pains practically never experience the phantom pains during sexual arousal. The remainder of the chapter discusses in detail transient central nervous system changes. Diminution of stuttering and gagging is reported, as well as histories indicating that spastics are able to move more freely during sexual arousal. Even evidences of unusual muscular strength have been noted. Detailed descriptions of the extensive neuromuscular involvement during sexual arousal such that the whole body participates are developed by Kinsey in the chapter.

It would seem conceivable to me that the material dealing with diminution in sensory perception could be interpreted differently from the way it is discussed in the Kinsey Report. Could it not be that what is called "diminution in sensory

"perception" is not really a reduction of perception but that the sensory experience simply has a different meaning? It is not that the person, during the state of sexual arousal, is less responsive to the so-called offensive odour or taste—in other words, that he is responding less to these particular stimuli than otherwise—but that these particular stimuli have an entirely different meaning for him during the state of sexual arousal. When the person in this state feels less pain than one would expect would be caused by a stimulus of that intensity, the sensation of pain is not dulled, but transmuted into part of the pleasurable experience. Therefore, if one had some instruments or devices for measuring how much sensory perception was diminished, one would really be misled by such information. It would perhaps be better to try to find out something about the conditions under which what commonly is experienced as pain is experienced qualitatively in a different way.

We might say that the sexual state requires a certain set of conditions for it to be orgasmically satisfactory. If those conditions are met then the seemingly diminished sensory response to certain types of ordinarily offensive and painful stimuli is not interpreted during that state as offensive or painful, and only if these external stimuli are too intense, will the pleasurable experience be disrupted.

Could not one likewise postulate the possibility that the unusual strength, and other neuromuscular reactions that may appear during the sexual state, are not quantitatively increased, but that they represent a transient qualitatively new functioning of the individual?

The tendency to examine the nature of the orgasmic state as if were a set of events consisting of certain components and less of other components—let us say, a higher pulse rate and a diminished level of perception—has a somewhat atomistic flavour, and tends to obscure the nature of the difference between the orgasmic state and that which is not the orgasmic state.

It is conceivable that the orgasmic state is hardly an algebraic summation of various physiological characteristics. Although one might obtain some interesting sidelights about the nature of the orgasm by finding out that specific individual characteristics of the orgasmic state are different from some other state, one can easily lose sight of the possibility that one is

dealing with a problem qualitatively different when one discusses orgasm or the absence of orgasm, namely that a different kind of physiological process is in operation in each.

I would like to draw an analogy to emphasise further my opinion that scientific study should concern itself more with the qualitative aspect of the problem, rather than the quantitative aspect. I suggest that a very gifted musician is not only different from a capable musician on quantitative grounds but, much more importantly, on qualitative grounds. The same statement may apply to other fields of human expression such as poetry, art, science, sports, etc. The traditional methods of inquiry, where emphasis is placed on the quantitative criteria, have not shed much illumination on the nature of the extremes, whether orgasm, giftedness, talent or the like. It would seem to me that a change in the method of scientific inquiry is called for, in order to explore the qualitative differences in phenomena, which up to now have in effect been studied as though they were differences of degree rather than of essence.

Sex sublimation and social consequences

THE MARQUIS DE SADE
AND THE FIRST
Psychopathia Sexualis

Robert E. Taylor, Ph.D.

ROBERT E. TAYLOR, who is an assistant professor of French at New York University and also assistant editor of the Modern Language Association of America, began his serious research on the Marquis de Sade in 1846 while studying for his master's degree at Columbia University. In the course of his research since then he has spent much time in public and private libraries in France and the United States, has had access to manuscripts not generally seen, and has become acquainted with several descendants of Sade.

Dr. Taylor was graduated from Reed College in Portland, Oregon, and took his doctorate at Columbia University. He has spent some time in government service, and during the war he taught aerial navigation and flew combat missions in the Pacific as a navigator. Dr. Taylor is the author of a recent article on Sade which appeared in the *Yale French Studies*, and wrote all the items on Sade in *A Critical Bibliography of French Literature* (Syracuse University Press). At present he is at work on a book, and several articles on French literature of the eighteenth century.

THE MARQUIS DE SADE AND THE FIRST

Psychopathia Sexualis

Robert E. Taylor

It is surprising that after more than six thousand years of recorded history—to say nothing of any possible concomitant progress—a serious book dealing with one of the most fundamental drives in the human being should still round some eyes and arch the brows above them. But perhaps this should not surprise us after all, since the notions of “right” and “wrong” are not arrived at by each succeeding generation after a fresh appraisal of life, but are handed down instead amid sombre looks and mumbled ceremonies as if they came from some entirely other-worldly source.

The problem of whether or not religion owes its origin to man's wonder at the sexual rite is not in our province, but it does concern us that organised religions did codify sexual practices, calling some of them divinely inspired and approved by God, and others of them wicked sins. It is very likely true that sexual activities that do not contribute directly to an increase in population do in fact weaken the power of an organised church, and since church and state were one—or were supervised by interlocking directorates—all such activities become illegal as well as sinful, and began to be punishable with long prison terms, even with death. But after more than six thousand years of possible progress! Under a literal interpretation of the law in the State of Indiana, a biologist or psychiatrist who advises a boy that his habit of masturbation may not be endangering his sanity or his life may be accused of an act punishable as sodomy (see the Kinsey Report on the Male, p. 264), and in Oregon a man who chances to kiss his wife somewhere other than about her head runs the risk of paying for “the crime against nature” (see the Kinsey Report on the Female, p. 262).

Every age and place have produced a few men who have dared to examine this problem and question this kind of justice. But particularly we must go back to France in the eighteenth century, for that combination of time and country produced far more than merely the first balloon, or the first steamboat, or the first steam automobile, or the metric system; it produced also the first *psychopathia sexualis* and the modern science of sexology, to say nothing of modern chemistry, botany, zoology, and biology.

Anyone who knows the intellectual and social climate of eighteenth-century France will not be surprised that it fostered the first report on sexual behaviour and brought forth a man capable of writing it. In English the book would be called *The 120 Days of Sodom or the School of Libertinism* [*Les 120 journées de Sodome ou l'école du libertinage*], but it has never been translated into English. Its author was the Marquis de Sade, a dissolute but gifted nobleman, more often talked about than read, more often common-nouned than talked about. There is scarcely even a high school student today who does not use the word "sadism," although he may never have heard of Dr. Richard von Krafft-Ebing, the nineteenth-century psychiatrist who coined the word.

Eighteenth-Century Paris

Sade was born in Paris in 1740. English readers will find brief sketches of his life in the *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* by Havelock Ellis, in books about him by Geoffrey Gorer and C. R. Dawes, and in a recent translation of a study on him by Iwan Bloch. There is also a new biography by James Cleugh, but it adds very little. Even more recently a fine choice of translated selections from his writings, preceded by a study on him by Simone de Beauvoir (well-known author of *The Second Sex*), has come out. Those who know French may read the richly detailed biography by Gilbert Lely, the first volume of which has now appeared.

To say the least Sade lived fabulously, and the demands he made upon the girls who entertained him were perhaps excessive even for a man of his social standing. Considerable sums of money—furnished more often than not by his mother-in-law—and a title, shielded him from certain prosecutions, thus

letting him sink even more deeply into the pattern of licentious living that was to cost him more than twenty-eight years of freedom. It was in prison that Sade wrote his monumental compendium of sexual practices and aberrations. Walled off from real satisfaction, he created a world of imaginary sexual delights of his own, a world of six hundred aberrations. Sade's work, composed about 100 years before Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* and Ellis's *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, is still without parallel in medical and literary annals, and is likely to remain so until further phases of the question are analysed by succeeding Kinsey Reports.

But Sade was not a lone and isolated practitioner and there can be no real understanding of him without some knowledge of the society in which he lived. It was one of the most elegant periods in history, but one in which people recognized exactly what they wanted and were clever enough to use refinement to get it. The ladies could have themselves loved as often as they liked, for example, if they followed the custom of fainting. Few young men of the century were so stupid as to call for smelling salts after their sweethearts, fallen prey to the vapours, had fainted gracefully and conveniently away. One of Sade's contemporaries advised that "nothing is so cruel for a pretty woman as to have fainted in vain." That was one of the incongruities of the century; on the one side, a strict observance of all the niceties of etiquette, and, conversely, an open race to satisfy every sexual desire.

Paris was far in the lead of other cities in providing ways and means for all manner of sexual satisfaction to the nobles and the rich, but the underlying economics depended upon the exploitation of the poor. Montesquieu, famous for his *Spirit of the Laws*, observed that Paris was probably the most sensual city on earth, but he went on to say that life for the poor was probably hardest there; so "that one man may live deliciously, a hundred others must work incessantly."

Even the skilled artisans were making original contributions of their own, such as the bidet, which was invented toward the beginning of the century. The Marquis d'Argenson first described such an intimate little wash basin after a lady friend had given him audience while seated upon it. Bidets owned by such great ladies as Madame de Pompadour and Madame du Barry were costly art objects, some of them with clever mechanical refinements that have since disappeared.

The great nobles led the field in voluptuous living, and the monarchs themselves set the pace in the games of pleasure. The Duc d'Orléans, regent of France after the death of Louis XIV, was said to have preferred the incestuous embraces of his daughters to all others; it is a certain fact that he transformed his Palais Royal into one of the largest public or semi-public houses in the world. He and Madame de Tencin induced the young Louis XV to amuse himself with a mistress, and once the king had got the taste of freer living he had to have her two sisters as well. When the Cardinal Tencin, much talked about for his incestuous affairs, came to Louis' court from Italy, everyone was sure the king had sent for him to salve his own conscience, and the streets rang with bawdy songs purporting to tell the whole story.

It was toward 1750 (when Sade was about ten years old) that Madame de Pompadour, perhaps reluctantly, established the famous Parc-aux-Cerfs for him at Versailles and the great brothels of Paris of the latter part of the eighteenth century were more or less copies of the king's lavish *bordello* at Versailles. The most celebrated copy was probably the luxurious house operated by Madame Gourdan in the Rue des deux Portes (today the Rue Dussoubs) with a secret entrance (much used by the nobles and clergy) through a fine shop on the Rue Saint-Sauveur. Here there were drinks and delicacies to give fire to the most timid, and fantastic astringents to keep a working-girl as forever virginal as if she were figured on Keats' Grecian urn. In one of the rooms there was even the curious chair invented by the Duc de Fronsac, son of the Duc de Richelieu; any lady who had the misfortune to seat herself in it suddenly found herself thrust backward with her arms locked at her sides and with her legs equally secured but in a somewhat more immodest fashion. Most of the girls who worked in Madame Gourdan's establishment, like their sister members of "the oldest profession" elsewhere, began their careers wretchedly and ended them even more so. Many were simply abducted from their homes and pressed into service. An unhappy voice of that era set down this meaningful complaint: "If you have a pretty wife, then may she not be seen and fancied by one of the bureaucrats or by one of the red heels. They'll take her from you properly enough. And don't try to argue either, or it'll be off to the galleys with you, or off to the madhouse at Charenton."

The Marquis de Sade was to be carted off to Charenton, not because he defended a pretty wife, but rather because of his pointed demands for social reform in a booklet aimed at Madame Tallien who was in fact later banned from the court although Napoleon claimed that he had sent Sade to Charenton because of his obscene writings. Sade did staunchly defend the prostitutes, "those poor devils sacrificed by the state itself in the dubious aim of keeping a few wives virtuous."

Another splendid Parisian pleasure palace was the Hôtel du Roule. Casanova described it rather fully in his *Mémoires*. Curiously enough, Sade was later to use the brothel as a model in the novel called *Juliette*; although he never saw Casanova's work, nor Casanova his, their descriptions tally at all points. The mistress of the Hôtel du Roule was Justine Paris. When she died Madame Gourdan spoke the funeral oration over her body; the sermon revealed a woman who had lived very much as Juliette was later to live in Sade's novel. Advised by her dying parents to seek only sensual pleasure Justine complied in such haste that she gave up her virginity on her parents' coffin. And like Juliette, she travelled all over Europe, and was especially triumphant in Italy. It is probable that Sade got considerable information and background material directly from Madame Justine Paris. She may ever have given her name to his most important novel, the *Justine*. The contributions of such knowing bawds to the work that would later take form as the first *psychopathia sexualis* must have been enormous.

Also in the background of Sade's first *psychopathia sexualis* was a host of great and near-great writers who discussed such sexual practices increasingly in their works. Montesquieu wrote a book on love as well as one on law. La Mettrie wrote one on sexual enjoyment as well as others on philosophy and science. Restif de la Bretonne focused his attention so carefully on the private lives of the poor that he was dubbed with the pun "le Rousseau du ruisseau" (the Rousseau of the gutter). Voltaire soberly observed, after a gaily-written episode of affection between two girls and their monkey-lovers in his celebrated *Candide*, that there are "quarters of men just as there are men who are one quarter Spanish." It was in *La Religieuse* that Diderot attempted to explain sexual aberrations. His words illumine not only the Lesbian nuns of whom he was writing but even the long-imprisoned Marquis de Sade

himself: "There is the effect of cloistral seclusion. Man was born for society; separate him, isolate him, his ideas will fall apart; his character will turn into something strange; a thousand ridiculous ills will rise up in his heart; extravagant thoughts will germinate in his mind like brambles in an uncultivated waste."

Even more significant than anything Rousseau wrote about sexual aberrations were his confessions of his own masochistic practices. In his *Confessions* he explained that when he was a boy his governess whipped him, and that he found the experience so pleasing that, if he had dared, he would have seized upon every occasion to have her repeat it. So-called normal desires were stifled in Rousseau by this perversion; women appealed to him only in so much as he could imagine them whipping him. In his mature years, Rousseau could not easily indulge his passion, but he gave to it as much as he dared in the kind of scenes that were to be even more vivid about a century later in the novels of Sacher-Masoch—the Viennese novelist who was also to be "honoured" by Krafft-Ebing, who coined the word "masochism" as well as the word "sadism."

Even the great painters of the century executed many scenes inspired directly by sexual stimuli. Fragonard, one of the most outstanding, went so far as to paint a woman receiving an enema, and he was careful to depict nothing but pleasure in her features. The choice of subject was not unusual for the time. Toward the end of the century a vast array of graphically illustrated pornographic literature was sold quite openly.

There was enormous opportunity for mass expression of sadism and masochism in the eighteenth century. Diaries and legal papers indicate that someone was hanged or broken on the wheel nearly every other day in the public squares of Paris, and occasionally someone was burned alive or torn apart by horses. Now and then it might take a day or two for a hardy wretch to die dangling on the wheel, and it was far from uncommon for him to scream for water throughout the first night. The torturing and quartering of Damiens, the would-have-been assassin of Louis XV, took an especially long time, since he was stronger than the four horses assigned to pull him apart. In the end the public executioner had to help the horses by hacking the victim's muscles with an axe. Vantage points were sold all about the square for that event

and hawkers of balloons roamed through the crowd. Casanova was one of the onlookers, but he actually did most of his looking at two women on the balcony near him, whose gentlemen escorts had lifted their dresses from behind so as not to step upon them. What took place was exciting enough to occupy Casanova's attention for a full two hours. Casanova and the diarists set down plenty of facts and observations about such events but they stopped short of the real problem in the psychology of sex; it was left to the Marquis de Sade to point out and to stress the now obvious relationship between those cruelties and the sexual organisation of men and women.

Such was the background and such were the cues that brought the Marquis de Sade on the scene. In a sense, the sexual aspect of his literary effort (there are other important phases in his writings) began where *Theresa the Wise One* [*Thérèse philosophe*] ended, and thus he tended to continue a long line of forbidden—but very popular—literature. But on the whole his scenes of sexual gratification are utterly matter-of-fact, as if he had never intended them to be anything but impersonal observations. However, as the years of confinement embittered him, he seemed to range ever farther beyond what might be called the normal scope of imagination. His fellow men, with their self-imposed frustrations and miseries, were his oppressors. The instrument of that oppression was the law, which was at complete variance with human practices.

One hundred and sixty-five years ago Sade wrote, giving proper credit to Montesquieu who had suggested the thought, “Laws are a bad way to change manners and customs, and to suppress passions . . . Your barbarous, senseless, miserable laws serve only to punish and not to correct. . . . Change the form of your government and do not harass the citizen who, when the form of the government is bad, cannot help but be bad, because it is no longer he who is guilty, it is you, you, who could stop him from breaking the laws by changing those laws but, instead, leave those laws on the books, as odious as they are, just to have the pleasure of punishing those caught breaking them.”

Sade's words are somewhat emotional, since he was himself a victim of the laws, but basically they say exactly what the writers of the Kinsey Report on Women say today: “But the information which we have tried to secure has concerned

aspects of human behaviour which most persons consider confidential and ordinarily do not discuss with any except their most intimate friends. More than that, our openly expressed mores and the statute law (the overt culture) are so remote from the actual behaviour (the covert culture) of the average citizen that there are few persons who can openly discuss their histories without risking social or legal difficulties" (pp. 6-7). "Sex laws are unenforced and are unenforceable because they are too completely out of accord with the realities of human behaviour, and because they attempt too much in the way of social control," the authors of the Kinsey Report go on to say (p. 20).

Sade wrote: "You cannot change customs and habits by law; that is simple tyranny." The abuses Sade cried out against remain with us today; so do the martyrs. The Kinsey Report informs us that when a reform group or newspaper prods the police into a local vice drive, the number of arrests is increased one hundred per cent, "even though there may have been no change in the actual behaviour of the community, and even though the illicit sex acts that are apprehended and prosecuted may still represent no more than a fantastically minute part of the illicit activity which takes place every day in the community" (p. 18).

Sade then (to oversimplify the matter just a little) was himself a victim of shackles that men had long imposed upon themselves. Raging against prison life and those who obliged him to live it, he not only created a fantastic world of sex from his own imagination but he also made his oppressors his paper-world victims. Such a multitude of observations, such a world of imagining, had never been conceived of before, and it may be said that the Marquis, in this particular respect at least, towered over his contemporaries like the giant Gargantua over the little Parisians who had lost their bells.

The old saw—there's no disputing colours and taste—obsessed Sade like an ancient curse. He felt with all his being that it was true, and yet he saw that it was never applied except to the most trivial of problems—such as the preference of one for duck stuffed with truffles, or another for chicken with chestnut dressing—never to our basic drives. With inexorable tenacity he applied the dictum to the whole range of sexual behaviour, and thus became the first man in world history—as Ellis puts it—"who realised the importance of the

sexual question." He was sure that when the science of anatomy someday became perfected, the connection between the physical organisation and the tastes and cravings of every sort would be positively established, and then even the "pédants, legislators, tonsured swine, and hangmen" would have to admit that "a certain degree of acidity in the blood . . . suffices today to make of a man the object of your punishment or of your rewards."

Sade's interest in the sexual problem was always intense; aspects of it are to be found in almost all the major works that he wrote. His observations, however—even if one considers his complete works—tend to emphasise the psychopathic and the unusual, an almost inevitable situation when one considers his pent-up fury and resentment. In this respect his work differs widely from the reports so far furnished by the Institute for Sex Research at the University of Indiana. Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues have so far concerned themselves with what we like to call "normal" men and women. Sade and Dr. Kinsey thus start from different points, but they come closer and closer together as the present-day Report reveals with an ever sharpening clarity all the practices that "normal" people actually engage in. Sade can be called a poet who saw into a secret world through the power of his own personality and intuition. Dr. Kinsey is, of course, the scientist who details that secret world with such a mass of statistics that even those who have no use for poets must believe it and accept it.

That world that Sade created in the *120 Days of Sodom* from his own-life experience and from his own imagination remains unequalled even today for the variety and number of "cases" he described: "This is the story of a magnificent repast where 600 different dishes are offered for your pleasure. Will you eat them all? Certainly not, but this prodigious number removes every limit from your choice; choose the dishes you want and leave the rest. Do not declaim against the dishes you do not choose simply because they haven't pleased you; remember that they will please others and be philosophical about it."

If the science of sexology itself needed—or still needs—an excuse for its existence, probably none better could be found anywhere than Sade's preface to his *psychopathia sexualis*. After explaining there what he was going to do in his book he concluded that "whoever might describe and explain these aberrations would be producing the finest work possible on

human conduct and perhaps one of the most interesting, too. Such a statement of purpose does not differ fundamentally from one made today by Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues in their Report on Women (p. 9): "It is, moreover, the record of science that greater knowledge, as it has become available, has increased man's capacity to live happily with himself and with his fellow men."

120 days of Sodom

Sade's monumental study of sex aberrations can be briefly summarised as follows: Four very wealthy gentlemen decided to entertain themselves by listening to an account of every possible sexual perversion. For this purpose they sought out the most experienced harlots in all of France, and gathered together a large group of handsome boys and beautiful girls. With this company and with their wives, they betook themselves to a formidable castle belonging to one of their number, which was beyond chasms and mountains, and was made inaccessible in every way once the group had reached it. Such was the setting for a story that was the first *psychopathia sexualis* ever written and also one of the first Gothic novels.

The group—or what could survive of it—was to remain in its sombre retreat for four months. During the first month, La Duclô, the prettiest of the four harlots, was to describe the exact details of the one hundred and fifty simple passions or perversions. During the second, La Chanville, a pronounced tri-bade, was to recount in the same way one hundred and fifty compound perversions involving more than one person. It was to fall to La Martaine, a rather elderly sodomist, to analyse one hundred and fifty criminal perversions during the third month. And lastly, La Desgranges, who had lost a breast, three fingers and six teeth in her trade, was to detail one hundred and fifty perversions which always produced violent death.

The routine for each day was, moreover, strictly set down. The revellers got up at ten in the morning and were first visited by their four special male servants and a handful of young boys. At eleven they all went into what we might call the serving-girls' apartment; at the very least, we are permitted to say they had lunch there. From the girls' quarters they passed

on to the boys' apartment. Between one and two some fantasies took place in the chapel. From two to five everyone took part in the big meal of the day. At five the four gentlemen went into the conference room and were entertained there until six o'clock sharp, when the harlot whose turn it was to describe the perversions for that particular month began her tales. At ten o'clock each evening there was supper. With this combination of tales, and supper under their belts, the four worthies passed on into the great assembly hall, where they engaged in grandiose orgies that must have taxed the imagination of even the Marquis de Sade.

Sade brought to completion only the introduction and first part of the work. The last three parts he left simply in a somewhat detailed outline. Doubtless he would have embellished the whole of the work as he did the first part if the manuscript had not been lost to him when the Bastille was stormed in 1789. Incidentally, Sade helped bring the fall of that prison about when he screamed through a slop funnel from one of the forbidding towers to the people in the Rue Saint-Antoine below that prisoners were being tortured and killed inside the walls. The authorities carted him off to another prison so, when the Bastille fell on July 14, 1789, he was no longer there to be fêted with liberty; his manuscript, however, stayed behind and eventually turned up in Germany.

Sade's insight in *The 120 Days* surpasses the remarkable. He not only described in detail every sexual aberration that modern science has since observed, but he also attempted analyses and explanations, and he was aware of the importance of classification. To be sure the classifications that he set up have long since been discarded. But it was over a hundred years after the death of Sade that Lacassagne and Krafft-Ebing formulated their classifications, and their attempts, too, have since been discarded. Before Sade there had been no such attempt at all.

Of all the writers of the eighteenth century who dipped into the psychology of sex, Diderot was the only one whose work could do so much as suggest Sade's monumental achievement in this field. In *The Indiscreet Jewels* [*Les bijoux indiscrets*], the encyclopaedist did conceive of the notion that sexual perversions might be classified, but he went no further than the suggestion. Sade was the first to give real substance to the notion, and that is one reason why a great German physician

and scholar heralded his manuscript as a “document of enormous importance to civilisation” when it was discovered in Germany.

Because Sade was to will his name to a passion we call sadism, his analysis of that particular perversion is of special interest: “An unhappy aberration which makes us find pleasure in the misery of others; we feel that a violent commotion inflicted upon another sets up in the mass of our nerves a vibration whose effect irritates the animal spirits in the base of the nerves and obliges them to press the erector nerves and to produce what we call a lascivious sensation; as a consequence we begin to commit robberies and murders for the sole purpose of debauchery, as another, to enflame these same passions, may content himself with visiting girls.” The passage is more curious than scientific, but we cannot afford to laugh it off simply because of the presence of such quaint phrases as “animal spirits” and “erector nerves.” Sade was not the first to recognise the connection between love and pain; but he was the first to stress its importance, and he was, incidentally, the very first to recognise kleptomania as a sexual perversion.

Some people have damned the Marquis for bringing sadism into the world, just as some people are now damning Dr. Kinsey and his associates for corrupting our youth. Quite obviously Dr. Kinsey will corrupt no one, for he is only uncovering what has always existed in all of us. In the same way, Sade brought nothing new into the world, except perhaps his insight and his genius.

Sadism had, of course, existed for thousands of years before his birth. But there was no serious attempt to study this particular perversion until the latter part of the seventeenth century, when Meibom wrote a treatise on it in Latin. The number of such works increased in the eighteenth century. It is somewhat ironical that this one passion bears Sade's name, since it is one area where his originality of observation does not stand out, though he was indeed the first man to recognise and stress the total passion of algolagnia. The unique feature of every sadist in his work is the fact that each one experienced an equal pleasure in the passive acceptance of pain as well as in the active application of it. When Jean-Paul Sartre, our present-day existentialist, says that a sadistic-masochistic balance constitutes “normal” sexuality, he is echoing an idea very dear to Sade, and one that had not been conceived before him.

In similar fashion Sade first isolated and then tried to analyse all the other aberrations. There are no sexual norms in his writing. Each personage that he created was his own individual norm, an idea not re-echoed before Hirschfeld began his studies of the sexual problem almost in our own day. It is a part of the scientific attitude reflected now in the reports from Dr. Kinsey; one head is not to be preferred to another in the making of a graph—just be sure to count them all.

Dr. Kinsey considers it clear that the data he has "acquired may prove of value in the consideration of some of our social problems" (p. 7, Report on Women), though the possibility of reform was not why he and his colleagues began their research. The element of reform is never absent from the works of Sade either, though that was not why he began his field work. No one would deny that Sade was a naughty fellow, but to prove that he was naughtier than his contemporaries would be difficult indeed. In any case he paid for his orgies with twenty-eight years of prison life. Most of the time he spent in prison was because he had fallen in love with his sister-in-law and so gained the enmity of his rich and powerful mother-in-law. It was she who secured the simple letters (*lettres de cachet*) from the king that kept Sade behind medieval moats and high stone walls. He was let off scot-free at the only trial he ever had with the fine of a few livres for court costs. But even after that legal acquittal he remained in prison because of those letters.

We have already said that Sade's confinement probably drove him to write his *psychopathia sexualis*; it must have been the cause also that drove him to cry for political and social reforms. His political reforms, interesting and significant though they may be, do not concern us here; some of his social reforms, however, are very much to the point. Like d'Holbach and Diderot and a few others who came before him, Sade felt that religion—including the very notion of a godhead—was the greatest evil that had befallen man. Sade spent one year in prison, by the way, because as the head of a Revolutionary tribunal during the Reign of Terror he refused to send anyone to the guillotine, not even his mother-in-law who one day stood before him. He classed crimes of passion—including murder—in the natural order, but he considered official executions as inexcusable acts of cold blood. He viewed religion as the principal enemy of all human freedoms, particularly of

'sexual freedom, the right to enjoy as nature has given us to enjoy.

Dr. Kinsey may or may not share such extreme views, but likening human behaviour to an array of variously cooked dishes—as we saw Sade do in his preface—he says it is as if dieticians and biochemists were “denied the right to analyse foods and the processes of nutrition, because the cooking and proper serving of food may be rated a fine art, and because the eating of certain foods has been considered a matter for religious regulation” (p. 8, Report on Women). Sade would not have been surprised at the figures which reveal that devout Catholic women experience orgasm about one-half as frequently as Catholic women whom Kinsey classifies as religiously inactive (p. 522, Report on Women).

Furthermore, when Dr. Kinsey regrets that “there are some who have questioned the applicability of scientific methods to an investigation of human sexual behaviour” (p. 8, Report on Women) he is echoing a strong statement made by Sade many years before him: “But should we abuse the patience of our readers by painting still more atrocities? Have we not already sullied their imagination with our infamous descriptions? Must we hazard new ones? Yes, hazard them we must, the philosopher tells us; one cannot imagine how necessary these scenes are to the development of the personality; we are still ignorant of this science only because of the stupid reserve of those who have tried to write on these matters.”

We can understand then why Sade began his *psychopathia sexualis* with a slap at the social evils about him. The four noble gentlemen who engaged the four story-telling harlots and put on the whole show for their own amusement were introduced by Sade in his preface as four “leeches always on the look-out for public calamities which they themselves helped to increase rather than alleviate so that they might profit from them with greater advantage.” The calamities which enriched them particularly were “the considerable wars which Louis XIV had to carry on during the course of his reign, while exhausting the finances of the state and the faculties of the people.” One of the four gentlemen was a duke; another was a bishop; a third was a judge; the fourth was a financier; thus Sade was passing judgment on his society even by his choice of leading characters, who were, incidentally, the only ones to survive the orgies.

Sade and the Twentieth Century

So much for our orientation toward the past. Let us look more intently at the present now, and perhaps even at the future. In one sense it remained for our century to prove Sade right. Nineteenth-century critics, while admitting his enormous influence on the writers of their century privately to their friends, could say that Sade had created an unreal world. They could argue that he imagined a world of fantastic butchery just to satisfy desires crushed within him by the weight of the stone walls about him. They could complacently assure their intimates that his dream-world was a curious one, but that it had no conceivable connection with the real world, unless of course they were too offended even to admit that it was curious. They were many, too, who pretended great shock and assured their readers that Sade's works were such that they could never be touched even so lightly without leaving the fingers forever stained, the mind forever sick; these gentlemen probably did more than all others to advertise his work. But we in the twentieth century can scarcely put on such airs. We have seen the most fantastic of Sade's imaginings come to life in the concentration camps. We have seen men flayed alive, so that walls might be better decorated, so that table lamps might be more gaily covered. We have seen women whipped in all the obscene fashions that Sade ever thought of. We have seen thousands burned alive, other thousands gassed. We have seen these things done not by maniacs but by "normal" people, and not by a handful but by nations. The monsters Sade conceived in his writings are obviously very much with us; they live to some extent in each and every one of us.

But even today we are continuing to prove Sade right. It is not permitted that a screen husband and wife should sleep together in one bed in our movies, nor that we see over a specified number of centimetres of either one of them. The things that almost every child sees daily in his own home, we officially label obscene. On the other hand a screen husband may beat his wife up as often as he can catch her, and cowboy pictures, especially made for our children, are nothing but a sequence of one piece of bloody brutality after another. What we hope our children will never see at home we label good

entertainment in our movies. The comic books our children read are even worse than the movies they see. Our officialdom, so warped by the puritanical aspect of our culture as to believe that anything connected with love and the human body must be dirty, carefully cuts away anything "normal" from before our eyes, and leaves us only with an array of sexual perversions all the more violent as every natural sexual response has been sublimated. It is an ironic commentary that French children under sixteen are not allowed to see many of our cowboy and detective movies sent over to France, and that adult citizens of the United States are not allowed in their own country to see many French pictures which in France are seen by the whole family. This is a part of the world of Sade that Dr. Kinsey and his associates have not yet fully investigated. But this is a world they will have to investigate. When they do we may know more about such ugly things as race riots, mob violence, lynchings, and juvenile delinquency—not to mention the adult kind—than we know now. Sade's world of an infinite variety of fetishes, fixations, substitutions, sublimations, complexes, and transfigurations, all of them drawn in every conceivable degree from the ever so slight to the fantastically absolute, still marks the extremes which our scientists must reach before their job is done.

Sade produced what one may call a novel; Dr. Kinsey and his co-researchers have produced what must be called a scientific treatise. But both men show real concern for the reform of oppressive and taboo-inspired laws which only make law-breakers of the vast majority of people. Dr. Krafft-Ebing, on the other hand, differs radically in most of these respects from both Sade and Dr. Kinsey. It is to his credit, of course, that he was trying to understand the psychopath a little better; but it is scarcely to his credit that he did not investigate everyday sexual activity so as to be somewhat more sure of what psychopathic sexual behaviour might really be, and worst of all, perhaps, is the last paragraph of the preface to the first edition of his *Psychopathia Sexualis*—the first book actually to bear such a title—where he wrote: "A scientific title has been chosen, and technical terms are used throughout the book in order to exclude the lay reader. For the same reason certain portions are written in Latin."

Sade to Krafft-Ebing to Ellis to Kinsey

Light was never spread through darkness, Sade knew that perfectly well when he insisted, one hundred years before the German Victorian, that he was obliged to present his scenes to the reader because our ignorance of scientific sexual matters stems from the prudery of those who have dealt with them.

We are fortunate indeed that Dr. Kinsey and his fellow scientists agree here with the Marquis de Sade: "The scientist who investigates sexual behaviour seems under especial obligation to make his findings available to the maximum number of persons, for there are few aspects of human biology with which more persons are more often concerned. . . . As in other areas of science, the restriction of sexual knowledge to a limited number of professionally trained persons, to physicians, to priests, or to those who can read Latin, has not sufficiently served the millions of boys and girls, men and women who need such knowledge to guide them in their everyday affairs. . . . We believe that if we have any right to investigate in this field, we are under obligation to make the results of our investigations available to all who can read and understand and utilise our data" (p. 11, Report on Women).

A healthier and a more cheering statement was probably never written. We all owe Dr. Kinsey and his associates our deepest gratitude for what they have already done and for what they are doing on the task that still lies ahead. But in our gratitude to the scientists of today we must not fail to give a nod to such a precursor as the Marquis de Sade, who helped greatly to pave the way when he had nothing but daring, insight, and vision for his tools.

*Il n'est pas si dangereux de faire du mal à la
plupart des hommes que de leur faire trop de
bien.*

LA ROCHEFOUCAULD

THE CLASSIC ESSAY ON KINSEY

Perhaps the most universal approach to Kinsey, and certainly one of the most widely quoted, was Lionel Trilling's critical and interpretative review of the Male volume. Originally published in Partisan Review, it has been included in a volume of his essays—The Liberal Imagination—published by Messrs. Secker and Warburg, and this volume, in turn, has been reprinted in a paper-covered volume by Anchor Books. In addition, "Trilling on Kinsey" has been published in the Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic.

Professor Trilling considers Kinsey as a cultural phenomenon—the tremendous response by the general public to what is really a scientific treatise, a response the like of which the world has hardly ever seen. This article serves a double function. It serves as a commentary to the Male volume, and as an advantageous point of departure for considering the Female book.

THE KINSEY REPORT

Lionel Trilling

By virtue of its intrinsic nature and also because of its dramatic reception, the Kinsey Report,* as it has come to be called, is an event of great importance in our culture. It is an event which is significant in two separate ways, as symptom and as therapy. The therapy lies in the large permissive effect the Report is likely to have, the long way it goes toward establishing the *community* of sexuality. The symptomatic significance lies in the fact that the Report was felt to be needed at all, that the community of sexuality requires now to be established in explicit quantitative terms. Nothing shows more clearly the extent to which modern society has atomised itself than the isolation in sexual ignorance which exists among us. We have censored the folk knowledge of the most primal things and have systematically dried up the social affections which might naturally seek to enlighten and release. Many cultures, the most primitive and the most complex, have entertained sexual fears of an irrational sort, but probably our culture is unique in strictly isolating the individual in the fears that society has devised. Now, having become somewhat aware of what we have perpetrated at great cost and with little gain, we must assure ourselves by statistical science that the solitude is imaginary. The Report will surprise one part of the population with some facts and another part with other facts, but really all that it says to society as a whole is that there is an almost universal involvement in the sexual life and therefore much variety of conduct. This was taken for granted in any comedy that Aristophanes put on the stage.

There is further diagnostic significance to be found in the fact that our society makes this effort of self-enlightenment

* *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*, by Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin. Philadelphia: Saunders,

From *THE LIBERAL IMAGINATION* by Lionel Trilling. Reprinted by permission of Messrs Secker & Warburg Ltd.

through the agency of science. Sexual conduct is inextricably involved with morality, and hitherto it has been dealt with by those representatives of our cultural imagination which are, by their nature and tradition, committed to morality—it has been dealt with by religion, social philosophy, and literature. But now science seems to be the only one of our institutions which has the authority to speak decisively on the matter. Nothing in the Report is more suggestive in a large cultural way than the insistent claims it makes for its strictly scientific nature, its pledge of indifference to all questions of morality at the same time that it patently intends a moral effect. Nor will any science do for the job—it must be a science as simple and materialistic as the subject can possibly permit. It must be a science of statistics and not of ideas. The way for the Report was prepared by Freud, but Freud, in all the years of his activity, never had the currency or authority with the public that the Report has achieved in a matter of weeks.

The scientific nature of the Report must be taken in conjunction with the manner of its publication. The Report says of itself that it is only a "preliminary survey," a work intended to be the first step in a larger research; that it is nothing more than an "accumulation of scientific fact," a collection of "objective data," a "report on what people do, which raises no question of what they should do," and it is fitted out with a full complement of charts, tables, and discussions of scientific method. A work conceived and executed in this way is usually presented only to an audience of professional scientists; and the publishers of the Report, a medical house, pay their ritual respects to the old tradition which held that not all medical or quasi-medical knowledge was to be made easily available to the general lay reader, or at least not until it had been subjected to professional debate; they tell us in a foreword for what limited professional audience the book was primarily intended—physicians, biologists, and social scientists and "teachers, social workers, personnel officers, law enforcement groups, and others concerned with the direction of human behaviour." And yet the book has been so successfully publicised that for many weeks it was a national best seller.

This way of bringing out a technical book of science is a cultural phenomenon that ought not to pass without some question. The public which receives this technical report, this merely preliminary survey, this accumulation of data, has never, even

on its upper educational levels, been properly instructed in the most elementary principles of scientific thought. With this public, science is authority. It has been trained to accept heedlessly "what science says," which it conceives to be a unitary utterance. To this public nothing is more valuable, more precisely "scientific," and more finally convincing than raw data without conclusions; no disclaimer of conclusiveness can mean anything to it—it has learned that the disclaimer is simply the hall-mark of the scientific attitude, science's way of saying "thy unworthy servant."

So that if the Report were really, as it claims to be, only an accumulation of objective data, there would be some question of the cultural wisdom of dropping it in a lump on the general public. But in point of fact it is full of assumption and conclusion; it makes very positive statements on highly debatable matters and it editorialises very freely. This preliminary survey gives some very conclusive suggestions to a public that is quick to obey what science says, no matter how contradictory science may be, which is most contradictory indeed. This is the public that, on scientific advice, ate spinach in one generation and avoided it in the next, that in one decade trained its babies to rigid Watsonian schedules and believed that affection corrupted the infant character, only to learn in the next decade that rigid discipline was harmful and that cuddling was as scientific as induction.

Then there is the question of whether the Report does not do harm by encouraging people in their commitment to mechanical attitudes toward life. The tendency to divorce sex from the other manifestations of life is already a strong one. This truly absorbing study of sex in charts and tables, in data and quantities, may have the effect of strengthening the tendency still more with people who are by no means trained to invert the process of abstraction and to put the fact back into the general life from which it has been taken. And the likely mechanical implications of a statistical study are in this case supported by certain fully formulated attitudes, which the authors strongly hold despite their protestations that they are scientific to the point of holding no attitudes whatever.

These, I believe, are valid objections to the book's indiscriminate circulation. And yet I also believe that there is something good about the manner of publication, something honest and right. Every complex society has its agencies which

are "concerned with the direction of human behaviour," but we today are developing a new element in that old activity, the element of scientific knowledge. Whatever the Report claims for itself, the social sciences in general no longer pretend that they can merely describe what people do; they now have the clear consciousness of their power to manipulate and adjust. First for industry and then for government, sociology has shown its instrumental nature. A government which makes use of social knowledge still suggests benignity; and in an age that daily brings the proliferation of government by police methods it may suggest the very spirit of rational liberalism. Yet at least one sociologist has expressed the fear that sociology may become the instrument of a bland tyranny—it is the same fear to which Dostoevski gave immortal expression in "The Grand Inquisitor." And indeed there is something repulsive in the idea of men being studied for their own good. The paradigm of what repels us is to be found in the common situation of the child who is *understood* by its parents, hemmed in, anticipated and lovingly circumscribed, thoroughly taped, finding it easier and easier to conform internally and in the future to the parents' own interpretation of the external acts of the past, and so, yielding to understanding as never to coercion, it does not develop the mystery and wildness of spirit which it is still our grace to believe is the mark of full humanness. The act of understanding becomes an act of control.

If, then, we are to live under the aspect of sociology, let us at least all be sociologists together—let us broadcast what every sociologist knows, and let us all have a share in observing one another, including the sociologists. The general indiscriminate publication of the Report makes sociology a little less the study of many men by a few men and a little more man's study of himself. There is something right in turning loose the Report on the American public—it turns the American public loose on the Report. It is right that the Report should be sold in stores that never before sold books, and bought by people who never before bought books and passed from hand to hand and talked about and also snickered at and giggled over and generally submitted to human. American popular culture has surely been made the richer by the Report's gift of a new folk hero—he already is clearly the hero of the Report—the "scholarly and skilled lawyer" who for thirty years has had an orgasmic frequency of thirty times a week.

As for the objection to the involvement of sex with science, it may be said that if science, through the Report, serves in any way to free the physical and even the "mechanical" aspects of sex, it may by that much have acted to free the emotions it might seem to deny. And perhaps only science could effectively undertake the task of freeing sexuality from science itself. Nothing so much as science has reinforced the moralistic or religious prohibitions in regard to sexuality. At some point in the history of Europe, some time in the Reformation, masturbation ceased to be thought of as merely a sexual sin which could be dealt with like any other sexual sin, and, perhaps by analogy with the venereal diseases with which the sexual mind of Europe was obsessed, came to be thought of as the specific cause of mental and physical disease, of madness and decay.* The prudery of Victorian England went forward with scientific hygiene; and both in Europe and in America the sexual mind was haunted by the idea of *degeneration*, apparently by analogy with the second law of thermodynamics—here is enlightened liberal opinion in 1896: "The effects of venereal disease have been treated at length, but the amount of vitality burned out through lust has never been and, perhaps, never can be adequately measured."† The very word *sex*, which we now utter so casually, came into use for scientific reasons, to replace *love*, which had once been indiscriminately used but was now to be saved for ideal purposes, and *lust*, which came to seem both too pejorative and too human: *sex* implied scientific neutrality, then vague devaluation, for the word which neutralises the mind of the observer also neuterises the men and women who are being observed. Perhaps the Report is the superfetation of neutrality and objectivity which, in the dialectic of culture, was needed before sex could be free of their cold dominion.

Certainly it is a great merit of the Report that it brings to mind the earliest and best commerce between sex and science—the best thing about the Report is the quality that makes us remember Lucretius. The dialectic of culture has its jokes, and *alma Venus* having once been called to preside protectively over science, the situation is now reversed. The Venus of the

* See Abram Kardiner, *The Psychological Frontiers of Society*, p. 32 and the footnote on p. 441.

† Article "Degeneration" in *The Encyclopedia of Social Reform*.

Report does not, like the Venus of *De Rerum Natura*, shine in the light of the heavenly signs, nor does the earth put forth flowers for her. She is rather fusty and hole-in-the-corner and no doubt it does not help her charm to speak of her in terms of mean frequencies of 3.2. No *putti* attend her: although Dr. Gregg in his Preface refers to sex as the reproductive instinct, there is scarcely any further indication in the book that sex has any connection with propagation. Yet clearly all things still follow where she leads, and somewhere in the authors' assumptions is buried the genial belief that still without her "nothing comes forth into the shining borders of light, nothing joyous and lovely is made." Her pandemic quality is still here—it is one of the great points of the Report how much of every kind of desire there is, how early it begins, how late it lasts. Her well-known jealousy is not abated, and prodigality is still her characteristic virtue: the Report assures us that those who respond to her earliest continue to do so longest. The Lucretian flocks and herds are here too. Professor Kinsey is a zoologist and he properly keeps us always in mind of our animal kinship, even though he draws some very illogical conclusions from it; and those who are honest will have to admit that their old repulsion by the idea of human-animal contacts is somewhat abated by the chapter on this subject, which is, oddly, the only chapter in the book which hints that sex may be touched with tenderness. This large, recognising, Lucretian sweep of the Report is the best thing about it and it makes up for much that is deficient and confused in its ideas.

But the Report is something more than a public and symbolic act of cultural revision in which, while the Heavenly Twins brood benignly over the scene in the form of the National Research Council and the Rockefeller Foundation, Professor Kinsey and his coadjutors drag forth into the light all the hidden actualities of sex so that they may lose their dark power and become domesticated among us. It is also an early example of science undertaking to deal head-on with a uniquely difficult matter that has traditionally been involved in valuation and morality. We must ask the question very seriously: how does science conduct itself in such an enterprise?

Certainly it does not conduct itself the way it says it does. I have already suggested that the Report overrates its own

objectivity. 'The authors, who are enthusiastically committed to their method and to their principles, make the mistake of believing that, being scientists, they do not deal in assumptions, preferences, and conclusions. Nothing comes more easily to their pens than the criticism of the subjectivity of earlier writers on sex, yet their own subjectivity is sometimes extreme. In the nature of the enterprise, a degree of subjectivity was inevitable. Intellectual safety would then seem to lie not only in increasing the number of mechanical checks or in more rigorously examining those assumptions which had been brought to conscious formulation, but also in straightforwardly admitting that subjectivity was bound to appear and inviting the reader to be on the watch for it. This would not have guaranteed an absolute objectivity, but it would have made for a higher degree of relative objectivity. It would have done a thing even more important—it would have taught the readers of the Report something about the scientific processes to which they submit their thought.

The first failure of objectivity occurs in the title of the Report, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*. That the behaviour which is studied is not that of the human male but only that of certain North American males has no doubt been generally observed and does not need further comment.* But the intention of the word *behaviour* requires notice. By *behaviour* the Report means behaviouristic behaviour, only that behaviour which is physical. "To a large degree the present study has been confined to securing a record of the individual's overt sexual experiences." This limitation is perhaps forced on the authors by considerations of method, because it will yield simpler data and more manageable statistics, but it is also a limitation which suits their notion of human nature and its effect is to be seen throughout the book.

The Report, then, is a study of sexual behaviour in so far as it can be quantitatively measured. This is certainly very useful. But, as we might fear, the sexuality that is measured is taken to be the definition of sexuality itself. The authors are certainly not without interest in what they call attitudes, but they believe that attitudes are best shown by "overt sexual experiences." We want to know, of course, what they mean by

* The statistical method of the report lies, necessarily, outside my purview. Nor am I able to assess with any confidence the validity of the interviewing methods that were employed.

an experience and we want to know by what principles of evidence they draw their conclusions about attitudes.

We are led to see that their whole conception of a sexual experience is totally comprised by the physical act and that their principles of evidence are entirely quantitative and cannot carry them beyond the conclusion that the more the merrier. Quality is not integral to what they mean by experience. As I have suggested, The Report is partisan with sex, it wants people to have a good sexuality. But by good it means nothing else but frequent. "It seems safe to assume that daily orgasm would be within the capacity of the average male and that the more than daily rates which have been observed for some primate species could be matched by a large portion of the human population if sexual activity were unrestricted." The Report never suggests that a sexual experience is anything but the discharge of specifically sexual tension and therefore seems to conclude that frequency is always the sign of a robust sexuality. Yet masturbation in children may be and often is the expression not of sexuality only but of anxiety. In the same way, adult intercourse may be the expression of anxiety; its frequency may not be so much robust as compulsive.

The Report is by no means unaware of the psychic conditions of sexuality, yet it uses the concept almost always under the influence of its quantitative assumption. In a summary passage (p. 159) it describes the different intensities of orgasm and the various degrees of satisfaction, but disclaims any intention of taking these variations into account in its record of behaviour. The Report holds out the hope to respectable males that they might be as frequent in performance as underworld characters if they were as unrestrained as this group. But before the respectable males aspire to this unwonted freedom they had better ascertain in how far the underworld characters are ridden by anxiety and in how far their sexuality is to be correlated with other ways of dealing with anxiety, such as dope, and in how far it is actually enjoyable. The Report's own data suggest that there may be no direct connection between on the one hand lack of restraint and frequency, and on the other hand psychic health; they tell us of men in the lower social levels who in their sexual careers have intercourse with many hundreds of girls but who despise their sexual partners and cannot endure relations with the same girl more than once.

But the Report, as we shall see, is most resistant to the possibility of making any connection between sexual life and the psychic structure. This strongly formulated attitude of the Report is based on the assumption that the whole actuality of sex is anatomical and physiological; the emotions are dealt with very much as if they were a "superstructure." "The subject's awareness of the erotic situation is summed up by this statement that he is 'emotionally' aroused; but the material sources of the emotional disturbance are rarely recognised, either by laymen or scientists, both of whom are inclined to think in terms of passion, or natural drive, or a libido, which partakes of the mystic* more than it does of solid anatomy and physiologic function." Now there is of course a clear instrumental advantage in being able to talk about psychic or emotional phenomena in terms of physiology, but to make a disjunction between the two descriptions of the same event, to make the anatomical and physiological description the "source" of the emotional and then to consider it as the more real of the two, is simply to commit not only the Reductive Fallacy but also what William James called the Psychologist's Fallacy. It must bring under suspicion any subsequent generalisation which the Report makes about the nature of sexuality.†

* We must observe how the scientific scorn of the "mystic" quite abates when the "mystic" suits the scientist's purpose. The Report is explaining why the interviews were not checked by means of narcosynthesis, lie-detectors, etc.: "In any such study which needs to secure quantities of data from human subjects, there is no way except to win their voluntary co-operation through the establishment of that intangible thing known as 'rapport'." This intangible thing is established by looking the respondent squarely in the eye. It might be asked why a thing which is intangible but real enough to assure scientific accuracy should not be real enough to be considered as having an effect in sexual behaviour.

† The implications of the Reductive Fallacy may be seen by paraphrasing the sentence I have quoted in which Professor Kinsey commits it: "Professor Kinsey's awareness of the intellectual situation is summed up by his statement that he 'has had an idea' or 'has come to a conclusion'; but the material sources of his intellectual disturbances are rarely recognised, either by laymen or scientists, both of whom are inclined to think in terms of 'thought' or 'intellection' or 'cognition,' which partakes of the mystic more than it does of solid anatomy or physiologic function." The Psychologist's Fallacy is what James calls "the confusion of his own standpoint with

The emphasis on the anatomical and physiological nature of sexuality is connected with the Report's strong reliance on animal behaviour as a norm. The italics in the following quotation are mine. • "For those who like the term, it is clear that there is a sexual drive which cannot be set aside for any large portion of the population, by any sort of social convention. For those who prefer to think in simpler terms of action and reaction, it is a picture of an animal who, however civilised or cultured, continues to respond to the constantly present sexual stimuli, albeit with some social and physical restraints." The Report obviously finds the second formulation to be superior to the first, and implies with a touch of irony that those who prefer it are on firmer ground.

Now there are several advantages in keeping in mind our own animal nature and our family connection with the other animals. The advantages are instrumental, moral, and poetic—I use the last word for want of a better to suggest the mere pleasure in finding kinship with some animals. But perhaps no idea is more difficult to use with precision than this one. In the Report it is used to establish a dominating principle of judgment, which is the Natural. As a concept of judgment this is notoriously deceptive and has been belaboured for generations, but the Report knows nothing of its dangerous reputation and uses it with the naïvest confidence. And although the Report directs the harshest language toward the idea of the Normal, saying that it has stood in the way of any true scientific knowledge of sex it is itself by no means averse to letting the idea of the Natural develop quietly into the ideal of the Normal. • The Report has in mind both a physical normality—as suggested by its belief that under optimal conditions men should be able to achieve the orgasmic frequency of the primates—and a moral normality, the acceptability, on the authority of animal behaviour, or certain usually taboo practices.

It is inevitable that the concept of the Natural should haunt any discussion of sex. It is inevitable that it should make trouble, but most of all for a scientific discussion that bars judg-

that of the mental fact about which he is making a report." "Another variety of the psychologist's fallacy is the assumption that the mental fact studied must be conscious of itself as the psychologist is conscious of it." *Principles of Psychology*, vol. 1, pp. 196-97. •

ments of value. Thus, in order to show that homosexuality is not a neurotic manifestation, as the Freudians say it is, the Report adduces the homosexual behaviour of rats. But the argument *de animalibus* must surely stand by its ability to be inverted and extended. Thus, in having lost sexual periodicity, has the human animal lost its naturalness? Again, the female mink, as we learn from the Report itself, fiercely resists intercourse and must be actually coerced into submission. Is it she who is unnatural or is her defence of her chastity to be taken as a comment on the females, animal or human, who willingly submit or who merely play at escape? Professor Kinsey is like no one so much as Sir Percival in Malory, who, seeing a lion and a serpent in battle with each other, decided to help the lion, "for he was the more natural beast of the two."

This awkwardness in the handling of ideas is characteristic of the Report. It is ill at ease with any idea that is in the least complex and it often tries to get rid of such an idea in favour of another that has the appearance of not going beyond the statement of physical fact. We see this especially in the handling of certain Freudian ideas. The Report acknowledges its debt to Freud with the generosity of spirit that marks it in other connections and it often makes use of Freudian concepts in a very direct and sensible way. Yet nothing could be clumsier than its handling of Freud's idea of pregenital generalised infantile sexuality. Because the Report can show, what is interesting and significant, that infants are capable of actual orgasm, although without ejaculation, it concludes that infantile sexuality is not generalised but specifically genital. But actually it has long been known, though the fact of orgasm had not been established, that infants can respond erotically to direct genital stimulation, and this knowledge does not contradict the Freudian idea that there is a stage in infant development in which sexuality is generalised throughout the body rather than specifically centred in the genital area; the fact of infant orgasm must be interpreted in conjunction with other and more complex manifestations of infant sexuality*

* The Report also handles the idea of sublimation in a very clumsy way. It does not represent accurately what the Freudian theory of sublimation is. For this, however, there is some excuse in the change of emphasis and even in meaning in Freud's use of the word.

The Report, we may say, has an extravagant fear of all ideas that do not seem to it to be, as it were, immediately dictated by simple physical fact. Another way of saying this is that the Report is resistant to any idea that seems to refer to a specifically human situation. An example is the position it takes on the matter of male potency. The folk feeling, where it is formulated on the question, and certainly where it is formulated by women, holds that male potency is not to be measured, as the Report measures it, merely by frequency, but by the ability to withhold orgasm long enough to bring the woman to climax. This is also the psychoanalytic view, which holds further that the inability to sustain intercourse is the result of unconscious fear or resentment. This view is very strongly resisted by the Report. The denial is based on mammalian behaviour—"in many species" (but not in all?) ejaculation follows almost immediately upon intromission; in chimpanzees ejaculation occurs in ten to twenty seconds. The Report therefore concludes that the human male who ejaculates immediately upon intromission "is quite normal" [here the word becomes suddenly permissible] among mammals and usual among his own species." Indeed, the Report finds it odd that the term "impotent" should be applied to such rapid responses. "It would be difficult to find another situation in which an individual who was quick and intense in his responses was labelled anything but superior, and that in most instances is exactly what the rapidly ejaculating male probably is, however inconvenient and unfortunate his qualities may be from the standpoint of the wife in the relationship."

But by such reasoning the human male who is quick and intense in his leap to the lifeboat is natural and superior, however inconvenient and unfortunate his speed and intensity may be to the wife he leaves standing on the deck, as is also the man who makes a snap judgment, who bites his dentist's finger, who kicks the child who annoys him, who bolts his—or another's—food, who is incontinent of his faeces. Surely the problem of the natural in the human was solved four centuries ago by Rabelais, and in the simplest naturalistic terms; and it is sad to have the issue all confused again by the naïveté of men of science. Rabelais' solution lay in the simple perception of the *natural* ability and tendency of man to grow in the direction of organisation and control. The young Gargantua in his natural infancy had all the quick and intense responses

just enumerated; had his teachers confused the traits of his natural infancy with those of his natural manhood, he would not have been the more natural but the less; he would have been a monster.

In considering the Report as a major cultural document, we must not underestimate the significance of its petulant protest against the inconvenience to the male of the unjust demand that is made upon him. This protest is tantamount to saying that sexuality is not to be involved in specifically human situations or to be connected with desirable aims that are conceived of in specifically human terms. We may leave out of account any ideal reasons which would lead a man to solve the human situation of the discrepancy—arising from conditions of biology or of culture or of both—between his own orgasmic speed and that of his mate, and we can consider only that it might be hedonistically desirable for him to do so, for advantages presumably accrue to him in the woman's accessibility and responsiveness. Advantages of this kind, however, are precisely the matters of quality in experience that the Report ignores.*

And its attitude on the question of male potency is but one example of the Report's insistence on drawing sexuality apart from the general human context. It is striking how small a role women play in *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*. We learn nothing about the connection of sex and reproduction; the connection, from the sexual point of view, is certainly not constant yet it is of great interest. The pregnancy or possibility of pregnancy of his mate has a considerable effect, sometimes one way, sometimes the other, on the sexual behaviour of the male; yet in the index under *Pregnancy* there is but a single entry—"fear of." Again, the contraceptive devices which *Pregnancy, fear of*, requires have a notable influence on male sexuality; but the index lists only *Contraception, techniques*. Or again, menstruation has an elaborate mythos which men take very seriously; but the two

* It is hard not to make a connection between the Report's strong stand against any delay in the male orgasm and its equally strong insistence that there is no difference for the woman between a clitoral and vaginal orgasm, a view which surely needs more investigation before it is as flatly put as the Report puts it. The conjunction of the two ideas suggests the desirability of a sexuality which uses a minimum of sexual apparatus.

indexed passages which refer to menstruation give no information about its relation to sexual conduct.

Then too the Report explicitly and stubbornly resists the idea that sexual behaviour is involved with the whole of the individual's character. In this it is strangely inconsistent. In the conclusion of its chapter on masturbation, after saying that masturbation does no physical harm and, if there are no conflicts over it, no mental harm, it goes on to raise the question of the effect of adult masturbation on the ultimate personality of the individual. With a certain confusion of cause and effect which we need not dwell on, it says: "It is now clear that masturbation is relied upon by the upper [social] level primarily because it has insufficient outlet through heterosexual coitus. This is, to a degree, an escape from reality, and the effect upon the ultimate personality of the individual is something that needs consideration." The question is of course a real one, yet the Report strenuously refuses to extend the principle of it to any other sexual activity. It summarily rejects the conclusions of psychoanalysis which make the sexual conduct an important clue to, even the crux of, character. It finds the psychoanalytical view unacceptable for two reasons: (1) The psychiatric practitioner misconceives the relation between sexual aberrancy and psychic illness because only those sexually aberrant people who are ill seek out the practitioner, who therefore never learns about the large incidence of mental health among the sexually aberrant. (2) The emotional illness which sends the sexually aberrant person to find psychiatric help is the result of no flaw in the psyche itself that is connected with the aberrancy but is the result only of the fear of social disapproval of his sexual conduct. And the Report instances the many men who are well adjusted socially and who yet break, among them, all the sexual taboos.

The quality of the argument which the Report here advances is as significant as the wrong conclusions it reaches. "It is not possible," the Report says, "to insist that any departure from the sexual mores, or any participation in socially taboo activities, always, or even usually, involves a neurosis or psychosis, for the case histories abundantly demonstrate that most individuals who emerge in taboo activities make satisfactory social adjustments." In this context either "neuroses and psychoses" are too loosely used to stand for

all psychic maladjustment, or "social adjustment" is too loosely used to stand for emotional peace and psychic stability. When the Report goes on to cite the "socially and intellectually significant persons," the "successful scientists, educators, physicians," etc., who have among them "accepted the whole range of the so-called abnormalities," we must keep in mind that very intense emotional disturbance, known only to the sufferer, can go along with the efficient discharge of social duties, and that the psychoanalyst could counter with as long a list of distinguished and efficient people who do consult him.

Then, only an interest in attacking straw-men could have led the Report to insist that psychoanalysis is wrong in saying that *any* departure from sexual mores, or *any* participation in sexually taboo activities, involves a neurosis or a psychosis, for psychoanalysis holds nothing like this view. It is just at this point that distinctions are needed of a sort which the Report seems not to want to make. For example: the Report comes out in a bold and simple way for the naturalness and normality and therefore for the desirability of mouth-genital contacts in heterosexual love-making. This is a form of sexual expression which is officially taboo enough, yet no psychoanalyst would say that its practice indicated a neurosis or psychosis. But a psychoanalyst would say that a person who disliked or was unable to practice any other form of sexual contact thereby gave evidence of a neurotic strain in his psychic constitution. His social adjustment, in the rather crude terms which the Report conceives of it, might not be impaired, but certainly the chances are that his psychic life would show signs of disturbance, not from the practice itself but from the psychic needs which made him insist on it. It is not the breaking of the taboo but the emotional circumstance of the breaking of the taboo that is significant.

The Report handles in the same oversimplified way and with the same confusing use of absolute concepts the sexual aberrancy which is, I suppose, the most complex and the most important in our cultural life, homosexuality. It rejects the view that homosexuality is innate and that "no modification of it may be expected." But then it goes on also to reject the view that homosexuality provides evidence of a "psychopathic personality." "Psychopathic personality" is a very strong term which perhaps few analysts would wish to use in this connection. Perhaps even the term "neurotic"

would be extreme in a discussion which, in the manner of the Report, takes "social adjustment," as indicated by status, to be the limit of its analysis of character. But this does not leave the discussion where the Report seems to want to leave it—at the idea that homosexuality is to be accepted as a form of sexuality like another and that is as "natural" as heterosexuality, a judgment to which the Report is led in part because of the surprisingly large incidence of homosexuality it finds in the population. Nor does the practice of "an increasing proportion of the most skilled psychiatrists who make no attempt to redirect behaviour, but who devote their attention to helping an individual accept himself" imply what the Report seems to want it to, that these psychiatrists have thereby judged homosexuality to be an unexceptionable form of sexuality; it is rather that, in many cases, they are able to effect no change in the psychic disposition and therefore do the sensible and humane next best thing. Their opinion of the etiology of homosexuality as lying in some warp—as our culture judges it—of the psychic structure has not, I believe, changed. And I think that they would say that the condition that produced the homosexuality also produced other character traits on which judgment could be passed. This judgment need by no means be totally adverse; as passed upon individuals it need not be adverse at all; but there can be no doubt that a society in which homosexuality was dominant or even accepted would be different in nature and quality from one in which it was censured.

That the Report refuses to hold this view of homosexuality, or any other view of at least equivalent complexity, leads us to take into account the motives that animate the work, and, when we do, we see how very characteristically *American* a document the Report is. In speaking of its motives, I have in mind chiefly its impulse toward acceptance and liberation, its broad and generous desire for others that they be not harshly judged. Much in the Report is to be understood as having been dictated by a recoil from the crude and often brutal rejection which society has made of the persons it calls sexually aberrant. The Report has the intention of habituating its readers to sexuality in all its manifestations; it wants to establish, as it were, a democratic pluralism of sexuality. And this good impulse toward acceptance and liberation is not unique with the Report

but very often shows itself in those parts of our intellectual life which are more or less official and institutionalised. It is, for example, far more established in the universities than most of us with our habits of criticism of America, particularly of American universities, will easily admit; and it is to a considerable extent an established attitude with the foundations that support intellectual projects.

That this generosity of mind is much to be admired goes without saying. But when we have given it all the credit it deserves as a sign of something good and enlarging in American life, we cannot help observing that it is often associated with an almost intentional intellectual weakness. It goes with a nearly conscious aversion from making intellectual distinctions, almost as if out of the belief that an intellectual distinction must inevitably lead to a social discrimination or exclusion. We might say that those who most explicitly assert and wish to practice the democratic virtues have taken it as their assumption that all social facts—with the exception of exclusion and economic hardship—must be *accepted*, not merely in the scientific sense but also in the social sense, in the sense, that is, that no judgment must be passed on them, that any conclusion drawn from them which perceives values and consequences will turn out to be “undemocratic.”

The Report has it in mind to raise questions about the official restrictive attitudes toward sexual behaviour, including those attitudes that are formulated on the statute books of most States. To this end it accumulates facts with the intention of showing that standards of judgment of sexual conduct as they now exist do not have real reference to the actual sexual behaviour of the population. So far, so good. But then it goes on to imply that there can be only one standard for the judgment of sexual behaviour—that is, sexual behaviour as it actually exists; which is to say that sexual behaviour is not to be judged at all, except, presumably, in so far as it causes pain to others. (But from its attitude to the “inconvenience” of the “wife in the relationship,” we must presume that not all pain is to be reckoned with.) Actually the Report does not stick to its own standard of judgment; it is, as I have shown, sometimes very willing to judge among behaviours. But the preponderant weight of its argument is that a fact is a *physical* fact, to be considered only in its physical aspect and apart from any idea or ideal that might

make it a social fact, as having no ascertainable personal or cultural meaning and no possible consequences—as being, indeed, not available to social interpretation at all. In short, the Report by its primitive conception of the nature of fact quite negates the importance and even the existence of sexuality as a social fact. That is why, although it is possible to say of the Report that it brings light, it is necessary to say of it that it spreads confusion.

EPILOGUE

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a period ending only one and a half centuries ago, the intellectual world was ravaged by conflict. Christian doctrines were being challenged—not because the challengers were suddenly becoming anti-Christian, but because their inklings of understandings of Nature were contrary to the explanations of the universe that had been woven into Christian doctrine. The staunch defenders of Christianity interpreted all discoveries as attacks, and most of the discoverers were therefore labelled as heretics, or as meddlers with controversial subjects.

The period was not one of individuals in conflict so much as it was one of systems in conflict. These two systems were the old revelation-scheme of Genesis, married to Aristotle, and the new understanding that was being born of science. This conflict, and the ideas and the individuals involved, has been recorded in a most scholarly and authoritative way by Katharine Brownell Collier, in a dissertation published by Columbia University Press in 1834. Dr. Collier's study of systems, that is, ideas in conflict, may seem remote and far-fetched in relation to Kinsey and sexual behaviour in human males and females, and it would be, except for one thing. The conflict of systems that took place in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a conflict between methods of thinking. Christian doctrine had been built upon the old and traditional way, but the new system was built upon science—a new and revolutionary way of thinking.

As a matter of fact, the new way of thinking grew out of the old way. Many fervent theological philosophers participated in the building of science. Scholasticism itself, with so much meticulous care paid to ratiocination, promoted the scepticism, the curiosity, the experimentation that finally resulted in the discovery—the demonstrable discovery—that the earth did not stand still, was not the centre of the universe.

The documented account of this conflict of systems that took place during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is contained in a volume entitled *Cosmogonies of Our Fathers*. It

makes interesting and illuminating reading, even to twentieth century readers, particularly because this conflict is related to a scientific effort to arrive at an understanding of sexual behaviour in human males and females. To be sure, the volume does not talk of sex as *sex*, but it does talk of such things as spontaneous generation—a pre-scientific and semi-doctrinal explanation that accounted for conception, gestation, and birth, without benefit of, or need for, sperms or ova, genes or chromosomes.

One thing that this volume shows, in addition to many other important insights, is that man did not jump from Genesis to embryology. There were many intervening stages of understanding, and of conviction. The growth of knowledge was slow, gradual, and usually painful. Another thing that it shows is the inevitability of intellectual development, when free give-and-take is instituted under the auspices of science.

There is little that these seventeenth and eighteenth century discoverers *discovered* that is accepted today. The astronomers, the physicists, the anatomists, the botanists, the geologists—all were but points in progress between old and *final* knowledge and newer and better, but never perfect or final knowledge. In this process, and in this period, man has learned more about nature than man had ever learned or suspected in five thousand years of organised and formal thinking. He has done this by virtue of that thinking which is called science. The transition is fitful, but the progress is conspicuous. It is a far cry from Pliny and Aristotle to Buffon, to Linnaeus, to Darwin and Mayr and Dobzhansky, but none of the latter is without debt to any of the former.

Dr. Collier ends her book with these words:

“This discussion has attempted to show the vast change in orientation from 1600 to 1800. New discoveries and observations transformed *man's* conception of the universe and its history. Not only had the heliocentric system superseded the geocentric, and the Newtonian theory of gravitation Descartes's vortices; but also the relation of the Bible to knowledge had been reinterpreted so that the view had come to be generally accepted that the Bible taught religious and moral truth rather

From *Cosmogonies of Our Fathers* by Katharine Brownell Collier. Reprinted by permission of Columbia University Press, New York.

than scientific. Both Catholics and Protestants affirmed this distinction. Most difficulties inherent in the Mosaic account of creation, when compared with the record inscribed in the earth itself, had been met by the simple device of lengthening the time involved in creation. The necessity for such readjustment was heightened by the altered attitude towards the method of creation. On the whole, the tendency in 1600 was to accept direct catastrophic action by an anthropomorphic God, while two hundred years later the idea of miraculous intervention in the production of the world and in its destruction had been largely discarded except for the preliminary production of matter, the creation of man and perhaps of other organic beings; instead of this idea, the search for appropriate secondary causes engaged the minds of theologians and scientists. During the same period the Aristotelian doctrines which, fostered by the universities, had lingered into the seventeenth century, and the marvellous tales of natural history collected by Pliny and other early scientists, were discredited in the light of nature study assisted by the superior tools of the new age. The two centuries displayed the manner in which great additions have been incorporated into the sum of knowledge and in which the traditional religious account has been brought into peaceful and harmonious relationship with the new, scientific doctrines."

If we learn anything from Dr. Collier it is that agreement is not necessary to scientific progress. On the contrary, it may be that the greater the disagreement, the greater the scientific progress. Certainly this has been true in the case of modern scientific inquiry.

On the whole there is little agreement in this volume of comment on Kinsey and his investigation of sexual behaviour in the human male and female. On the other hand, there is but small feeling that he is not proceeding, or attempting to proceed, on a scientific basis, and in accordance with a method that has been phenomenally successful during the last three centuries. If as a result of the accomplishments of this method, our ideas about God have changed so much, why should it be doubted that our ideas about lesser things might not change at least as much?

God produced man differently than science does. Sex is a part of man. The religious understandings of sex in man may

prove to be no more valid than were the religious understandings of the Genesis of man.

The ending of Dr. Collier's book has been quoted above. Let us end with the beginning of her book:

"The history of thought is in large part the attempt to interpret old knowledge and dogma by the light of new discoveries. Frequently such exposition has taken the form of an effort to reconcile the doctrines of ancient religious teachers with the more recent conclusions of science. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries present clearly a typical example of such a controversy with the customary bitter words, aspersions upon character and even persecutions directed against the champions of innovation. Almost universal hostility to the heliocentric astronomy of Copernicus, Kepler, and Newton and to the enlarged view of a Wright and Kant, which subordinated the solar system to a greater whole, was aroused by the belief that such theories conflicted with revealed statements in the Bible implying a geocentric, or perhaps homocentric, universe, created by God from nothing in six days. Gradually as proofs accumulated, the hostility was replaced by marvellous hypotheses explaining the Biblical text in terms of the new truths, and finally by acceptance as axiomatic of the scientific principles involved.

The painful readjustment necessitated by so radical a change in scientific and religious beliefs produces four types of reaction, probably due to differences in the temperaments and the previous ideas of the individuals involved. The first type is a vigorous rejection of all new thought that does not square with the old; the second, a discarding of all the old because of its apparent disagreement with the new; the third, a peculiar arrangement of the mind in thought-tight compartments to prevent any influence from one set of doctrines upon another; and the fourth, an attempt to harmonise the new with the old thought. The third reaction is unquestionably the least disturbing and has in all ages been the resort of countless men in the semi-scientific professions, such as medicine, while the fourth is both the most interesting and the most prolific in controversial literature."

At any rate, science, despite its many false starts, its hemming and hawing, its hauling and pulling, has made notable progress,

to the accompaniment of many ideas that have been short-lived, and as the result of such ideas. Such progress, however, has been marked by the ingenuity and the plasticity of the group Dr. Collier has numbered four. And, her reference to the semi-sciences notwithstanding, it appears that the contributors to this book, including the doctors of medicine, all fall within that category.

Remaining, of course, is the question—into which category does the reader fall?